

National Collegiate Athletic Association

1984 Convention

Proceedings



78th Annual Convention
January 9-11, 1984
Dallas, Texas

Table of Contents

Proceedings

of the

78th Annual Convention

of the

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Loews Anatole Hotel

Dallas, Texas

January 9-11, 1984



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Nall Avenue at 63rd Street

P.O. Box 1906

Mission, Kansas 66201

913/384-3220

April 1984

[ISSN 0077-3803]

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Table of Contents

I. Register 1984

Administrative Organization	6
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media	16

II. Proceedings of the 78th NCAA Convention

Division I-A Round Table	38
Division I-AA Round Table	40
Division I-Other Round Table	43
Division II Round Table	47
Division III Round Table	50
Opening General Session	
1. Opening Remarks	54
2. Report of the Football Television Committee	56
3. Report of the Council	57
4. Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee	60
Honors Luncheon	62
Division I Round Table	79
Business Session	
5. Acceptance of Reports	81
6. Proposed Amendments	
Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules	81
Consent Package—Bylaws and Other Legislation	81
Committee on Competitive Safeguards and	
Medical Aspects of Sports	81
Sports Committees—Secretary-Rules Editors	82
Satisfactory Progress	83
Satisfactory Progress	84
Transfer—Junior College	88
Transfer—Junior College	88
Satisfactory Progress—Academic Degree Credit	89
Resolution: Freshman Eligibility	90
Junior College Grade-Point Requirement	91
Principles of Sound Academic Standards	91
Eligibility—2.000 Rule	91
Eligibility—2.000 Rule	92
Board of Presidents	92
Continuation of Business Session	
7. Proposed Amendments	
Board of Presidents	112
NCAA Presidents' Commission	112
Resolution: Roll-Call Vote	118
Division I Voting	118
Division I-A Voting	125
NCAA Council	126
NCAA Council	126
Resolution: Women's Meeting	127

Allied Conference Voting	128
Sports Committees	129
Volunteers for Youth Committee	129
Football Television Committee	129
Financial Aid Limitation	130
Financial Aid—Pell Grants	130
Financial Aid—Summer School	131
Financial Aid—Room and Board	132
Financial Aid—Undergraduate Student-Athletes	133
Financial Aid—Established Awards	134
Income From Officiating	134
Financial Aid—Summer School	135
Maximum Awards—Equivalencies	135
Maximum Awards—Equivalencies	136
Maximum Awards—Equivalencies	136
Maximum Awards—Division I	137
Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football	137
Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football	139
Maximum Awards—Men's Ice Hockey	140
Multiple Sport Participants—Women	140
Individual Outside Competition	140
Individual Eligibility	142
Transfer Rule—Subvarsity Competition	142
Seasons of Competition	142
Eligibility—Junior College Transfer	143
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception	144
Transfer Rule—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete	144
Transfer Rule—Division III	145
Five-Year Rule—Waivers	145
Seasons of Competition	146
Seasons of Competition	146
Continuation of Business Session	
8. Proposed Amendments	148
Seasons of Competition	148
Student-Athlete Statement—Gambling Activities	149
9. Report of the Nominating Committee	150
10. Report of the Women's Committee on Committees	150
11. Report of the Men's Committee on Committees	150
12. Council Recognition	150
13. Proposed Amendments	
Division I-A Meeting	152
Division I Voting	152
Financial Aid—Pell Grants	152
Establishment of Championships	153
Continuation of Championships	154
Division III Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships	156

Division III Ice Hockey Championship	157
Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships	157
Division III Football Championship	160
Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships	160
Division III Football Championship	160
Seeding for Team Championships	161
Automatic Qualification—Division I Men's Basketball	162
Resolution: Division I-AA Football	163
Resolution: Division I Men's Ice Hockey	165
Recruiting Contacts	167
Recruiting Contacts	167
Employment of High School Coach	169
Recruiting Contact and Evaluation Periods—Basketball	170
Recruiting Contact and Evaluation Periods—Women's Basketball	171
Women's Basketball Recruiting Season	172
Football Recruiting Season	172
Football Evaluation Periods	173
Complimentary Admissions	174
Complimentary Meal	174
Recruiting Contact—All-Star Game	174
Division I Criteria	174
Resolution: Drug Testing	177
Division II Criteria	177
Resolution: Football Television	178
Membership Effective Date	179
Amateurism—Name or Picture	179
Permissible Expenses—World University Games	179
Complimentary Meal	180
Permissible Expenses—Athletic Career Counseling	180
Permissible Expenses—Complimentary Admission	181
Basketball Playing Season	182
Permissible Expenses—Special Recognition	182
Infractions—Council Appeal Procedure	182
Basketball Playing Season	182
Permissible Awards	183
Ethical Conduct—Gambling Activities	183
Gambling and Bribery	183
14. Special Recognition	183

III. Appendices

A. Legislative Proposals	A- 1
B. Convention Committees	A-110
C. NCAA Convention Sites	A-112
D. Past and Present NCAA Officers	A-113

1984 NCAA Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer), division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

John L. Toner
Director of Athletics
University of Connecticut, Box U-78
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Secretary-Treasurer

John R. Davis
Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station, Ag Hall 127
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Division I Vice-President: Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University

Division II Vice-President: Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University

Division III Vice-President: Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College

Executive Director

Walter Byers
Nall Avenue at 63rd Street
P.O. Box 1906
Mission, Kansas 66201

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The remainder of the Council includes 22 from Division I members (including at least six women), 11 from Division II members (including at least three women) and 11 from Division III members (including at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division round table during the annual Convention. [Constitution 5-1.]

Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Eve Atkinson Director of Women's Athletics Hofstra University Hempstead, New York 11550	I-Other	Jan. 1986*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution

Wilford S. Bailey
Professor
Auburn University
Hargis Hall
Auburn, Alabama 36849

William H. Baughn
Dean, Graduate School of
Business, Room 239
University of Colorado
Campus Box 419
Boulder, Colorado 80309

Francis W. Bonner
Professor of English
Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina 29613

William D. Bradford, M.D.
Professor of Pathology
Duke University
Box 3712 Duke Medical Center
Durham, North Carolina 27710

Richard W. Burns
Professor of Curriculum, College
of Education
University of Texas
Education Building
El Paso, Texas 79968

G. Jean Cerra-Decker
Associate Director of Athletics
University of Missouri, Box 677
Columbia, Missouri 65205

Eugene F. Corrigan
Director of Athletics
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Lewis A. Cryer, Commissioner
Pacific Coast Athletic
Association
1700 E. Dyer Road, Suite 140
Santa Ana, California 92705

Jack V. Doland
President
McNeese State University
Ryan Street
Lake Charles, Louisiana 70609

Term Expires

I-A Jan. 1987*
Southeastern
Conference

I-A Jan. 1986*
Big 8
Conference

I-AA Jan. 1985*
South

I-A Jan. 1988*
Atlantic Coast
Conference

I-A Jan. 1986*
Western Athletic
Conference

I-At Large Jan. 1987*

I-A Jan. 1988*
Independent
(North)

I-A Jan. 1987*
Pacific Coast
Athletic Association

I-AA Jan. 1988*
West

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>		<i>Term Expires</i>
Mikki Flowers Associate Director of Athletics Old Dominion University Hampton Boulevard Norfolk, Virginia 23508	I-Other	Jan. 1988*
Thomas J. Frericks Vice-President; Dir. of Athletics University of Dayton 300 College Park Dayton, Ohio 45469	I-Other	Jan. 1986*
Mary A. Hill Director of Athletics San Diego State University San Diego, California 92182	I-At Large	Jan. 1987*
John W. Kaiser Vice-President; Dir. of Athletics St. John's University Jamaica, New York 11439	I-Other	Jan. 1988*
David L. Maggard Director of Athletics University of California Memorial Stadium Berkeley, California 94720	I-A Pacific-10 Conference	Jan. 1988*
Andrew T. Mooradian Director of Men's Athletics University of New Hampshire Main Street Durham, New Hampshire 03824	I-AA East	Jan. 1986*
Gwendolyn Norrell Professor Counseling Center 207 Student Services Building Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1113	I-A Big Ten Conference	Jan. 1985*
Sondra Norrell-Thomas Associate Director of Athletics Howard University Burr Gym Washington, D.C. 20059	I-At Large	Jan. 1987*
Arliss L. Roaden President Tennessee Technological University P.O. Box 5007 Cookeville, Tennessee 38505	I-AA Central	Jan. 1985
Charles H. Samson Professor of Civil Engineering Texas A&M University College Station, Texas 77843	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference	Jan. 1985*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>		<i>Term Expires</i>
Richard G. Shrider Director of Athletics Miami University Room 236, Millett Hall Oxford, Ohio 45056	I-A Mid-American Athletic Conference	Jan. 1985*
Hindman Wall Director of Athletics Tulane University Monk Simons Building New Orleans, Louisiana 70118	I-A Independent (South)	Jan. 1986*

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Joan Boand Coordinator of Women's Athletics Grand Valley State College 187 Fieldhouse Allendale, Michigan 49401	Jan. 1985
Judith M. Brame Director of Women's Athletics California State University 18111 Nordhoff Northridge, California 91330	Jan. 1986*
Rudy Carvajal Director of Athletics California State University 9001 Stockdale Highway Bakersfield, California 93311	Jan. 1987*
Howard Elwell Director of Athletics Gannon University University Square Erie, Pennsylvania 16541	Jan. 1985
Asa N. Green President Livingston University Livingston, Alabama 35470	Jan. 1987*
Bob Moorman, Commissioner Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association 2013 Cunningham Drive, Suite 241 Hampton, Virginia 23666	Jan. 1986*
Nancy J. Olson Director of Athletics Florida International University Tamiami Trail Miami, Florida 33199	Jan. 1988*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Milton J. Piepul, Chair, Department of Athletics and Physical Education; Director of Athletics American International College, 1000 State Street Springfield, Massachusetts 01109	Jan. 1985
James R. Spalding Director of Athletics Bellarmine College Newburg Road Louisville, Kentucky 40205	Jan. 1987*
Ade L. Sponberg Director of Athletics North Dakota State University University Station Fargo, North Dakota 58105	Jan. 1988*
Richard B. Yoder Director of Athletics West Chester University of Pennsylvania West Chester, Pennsylvania 19383	Jan. 1988*

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Anthony Diekema President Calvin College 3201 Burton Street, S.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506	Jan. 1987*
Robert W. Hatch Director of Athletics Bates College Campus and Central Avenues Lewiston, Maine 04240	Jan. 1988*
Thomas M. Kinder Director of Athletics; Chair, Physical Education Dept. Bridgewater College East College Street Bridgewater, Virginia 22812	Jan. 1985
Elizabeth A. Kruczek Director of Athletics Fitchburg State College 160 Pearl Street Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01420	Jan. 1986*
Mary Jean Mulvaney Chair, Department of Physical Education & Athletics	Jan. 1987*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
University of Chicago 55640 South University Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637	
Edwin D. Muto Director of Men's Athletics State University of New York, Buffalo Alumni Arena, Room 106 Buffalo, New York 14260	Jan. 1985*
Russell J. Poel Professor, Chemistry Department North Central College Naperville, Illinois 60566	Jan. 1988*
Robert T. Shields Director of Athletics Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison 285 Madison Avenue Madison, New Jersey 07940	Jan. 1986*
Judith M. Sweet Director of Athletics University of California, San Diego C-107 La Jolla, California 92093	Jan. 1985
Patricia A. Thompson Assistant Director of Athletics Elmira College Murray Athletic-Education Center 4229 Middle Road Horseheads, New York 14845	Jan. 1987*
Elmer W. Yoest Director of Athletics Otterbein College Rike Center Westerville, Ohio 43081	Jan. 1986*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents automatically are members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for a term of five years. The terms of no more than two of the nine Council-elected members shall expire in any one year. [Constitution 5-2.]

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
I-A	Ernest C. Casale Assistant to the President Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122	Jan. 1985*
II	Connie Claussen Coordinator, Women's Athletics University of Nebraska, Omaha 60th and Dodge Street Omaha, Nebraska 68182	Jan. 1988*
I-Other	Robert H. Frailey Director of Athletics American University Washington, D.C. 20016	Jan. 1988*
I-AA	Barbara B. Hollmann Associate Director of Athletics University of Montana Adams Field House Missoula, Montana 59812	Jan. 1987*
I-A	Fred Jacoby Commissioner Southwest Athletic Conference P.O. Box 47420 1300 West Mockingbird Lane, Suite 444 Dallas, Texas 75247	Jan. 1987*
III VP	Elizabeth A. Kruczek Director of Athletics Fitchburg State College 160 Pearl Street Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01420	Jan. 1986*
I VP	Gwendolyn Norrell Professor, Counseling Center 207 Student Services Building Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1113	Jan. 1985*
I-AA	Walter Reed Director of Athletics Jackson State University 1325 J. R. Lynch Street Jackson, Mississippi 39217	Jan. 1986*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
III	Robert F. Riedel Director of Athletics Geneseo State University College Geneseo, New York 14454	Jan. 1986*
I-A	Charley Scott Director of Athletics Mississippi State University Drawer 5327 Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762	Jan. 1985*
I-A	R. J. Snow Vice-President for University Relations University of Utah 206 Park Building Salt Lake City, Utah 84112	Jan. 1989*
II VP	Ade L. Sponberg Director of Athletics North Dakota State University University Station Fargo, North Dakota 58105	Jan. 1986*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

NCAA National Office

Walter Byers, *Executive Director*

Administration

Ruth M. Berkey, *Assistant Executive Director*

Louis J. Spry, *Controller*

Marjorie K. Fieber, *Business Manager*

Richard D. Hunter, *Director of Finance*

Stephen R. Morgan, *Director of Legislative Services*

Thomas E. Yeager, *Assistant Director of Legislative Services*

John H. Leavens, *Assistant Director of Legislative Services*

Janice I. Bump, *Legislative Assistant*

Harold Cissna, *Building Superintendent*

Kathleen M. Hatke, *Legislative Assistant*

E. Jamie McCloskey, *Legislative Assistant*

Roberta A. Rogers, *System Operator*

Lydia Sanchez, *Administrative Assistant*

Fannie B. Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*

S. Patricia Walden, *Administrative Assistant*

Shirley M. Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*

Eric D. Zemper, *Research Coordinator*

Championships

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Assistant Executive Director*

Patricia E. Bork, *Director of Women's Championships*

Jerry A. Miles, *Director of Men's Championships*

Daniel B. DiEdwardo, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Tamatha J. Gannon, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Ralph McFillen, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Dennis L. Poppe, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Cynthia L. Smith, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Patricia W. Wall, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Communications

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director*

James W. Shaffer, *Director of Media Services*

John T. Waters, *Director of Marketing and Promotion*

Cheryl L. Levick, *Assistant Director of Communications*

James M. Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*

Alfred B. White, *Assistant Director of Communications*

Steve Boda Jr., *Associate Director of Statistics*

Jennifer A. Boyer, *Productions Coordinator*

Regina L. McNeal, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*

James F. Wright, *Statistics Coordinator*

Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service*
1888 Seventh Avenue, Suite 1901, New York, N.Y. 10106

Enforcement

William B. Hunt, *Assistant Executive Director*

S. David Berst, *Director of Enforcement*

Michael S. Glazier, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

R. Dale Smith, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

Charles E. Smrt, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

R. Daniel Beebe, *Enforcement Representative*

David A. Didion, *Enforcement Representative*

L. Douglas Johnson, *Enforcement Representative*

Kevin J. McCormick, *Enforcement Representative*

Robert J. Minnix, *Enforcement Representative*

Marcia H. Morey, *Enforcement Representative*

Lynn A. Norenberg, *Enforcement Representative*

David V. Thompson, *Enforcement Representative*

Ronald E. Watson, *Enforcement Representative*

Publishing

Ted C. Tow, *Assistant Executive Director*

Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Publishing*

Thomas A. Wilson, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*

Bruce L. Howard, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*

David P. Seifert, *Assistant Director of Publishing*

Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*

Michael V. Earle, *Publications Editor*

Timothy J. Lilley, *Publications Editor*

David D. Ravel, *Publications Production Coordinator*

James A. Sheldon, *Publications Editor*

78th ANNUAL CONVENTION DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District 1

American International College: Milton J. Piepul
 Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding
 Anna Maria College: Stephen C. Washkevich
 Assumption College: Andrew Laska
 Babson College: Robert E. Hartwell
 Bates College: Robert W. Hatch
 Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
 Boston College: Mary Miller Carson, Kevin P. Duffy, William J. Flynn,
 Very Rev. J. Donald Monan, Rev. Joseph L. Shea
 Boston University: Richard G. Fecteau, Averill C. Haines, David E.
 Hollowell, John B. Simpson
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis
 Bridgeport, University of: Ann V. Fariss, Francis W. Poisson
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): George Ruggiero, Mary Lou
 Thimas
 Brown University: John C. Parry, Joan Taylor
 Bryant College: Leon A. Drury
 Central Connecticut State University: Henry S. Enck, Lowell Lukas,
 Richard McDuffie
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Walter P. Halas
 Colby College: Richard J. McGee
 Connecticut, University of: Patricia H. Meiser, John L. Toner
 Connecticut College: Charles Luce
 Curry College: Thomas G. Stephens
 Dartmouth College: Edward Leland, Louise O'Neal, Edward Shanahan
 Eastern Connecticut State University: William P. Holowaty
 Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook, William Schimpf
 Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek
 Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
 Hartford, University of: Robert A. Charnak, Gordon F. McCullough
 Harvard University: Derek C. Bok, John B. Fox Jr., Patricia H. Miller, John
 P. Reardon Jr.
 Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry
 Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato
 Lowell, University of: James Cizek, Denise Legault
 Maine, University of, Orono: Janet Anderson, Stuart P. Haskell Jr.
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David Bischoff, Chet Gladchuk,
 Aloysius Rufe, Harold J. VanderZwaag
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett, Charles Titus

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Royce N. Flippin Jr.
 Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio Jr., Joseph Lee
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson
 Mount Holyoke College: Sharon L. Crow, Mary Park Morison
 New Hampshire, University of: Gail A. Bigglestone, C. Robert Keesey,
 Andrew T. Mooradian
 New Hampshire College: Edward M. Shapiro
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete
 North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
 Northeastern University: Irwin Cohen, John A. Freeman, Jeanne Rowlands,
 Joseph P. Zabalski
 Norwich University: Joseph G. Sabol
 Pine Manor College: Gail Parks
 Plymouth State College: John P. Clark
 Providence College: Helen Bert, Louis A. Lamoriello
 Rhode Island, University of: John R. Chuckran, Eleanor Lemaire
 Rhode Island College: Gail H. Davis, David E. Sweet
 Sacred Heart University: Dave Bike
 St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
 Salem State College: John D. Galaris
 Simmons College: Sheila Brown
 Smith College: Lawrence A. Fink
 Southeastern Massachusetts University: Judith A. Sullivan
 Southern Connecticut State University: Louise Albrecht, Raymond W.
 DeFrancesco, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald
 Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz
 Stonehill College: Thomas J. Folliard
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo
 Vermont, University of: Lattie Coor, Richard A. Farnham, Ben Forsyth,
 Sally Guerette, Denis E. Lambert, Keith M. Miser
 Wellesley College: Linda S. Moulton
 Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell
 Western Connecticut State University: Georgette Ashe-Kinney
 Western New England College: Beverly Holtsberg
 Westfield State College: Warren H. Hill
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Susan E. Chapman, James P. Culpepper Jr.
 Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin
 Yale University: James G. Holgate, Frank B. Ryan

District 2

Adelphi University: Laurence C. Keating
 Albany, State University of New York: William M. Moore, Patricia A.
 Rogers
 Alfred University: Eugene Castrovillo
 Allegheny College: Norman A. Sundstrom

American University: Robert H. Frailey
 Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Jessie A. Godfrey, Nell C. Jackson
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Joanne E. McComb, John S. Mulka, Roger B. Sanders
 Brockport State University College: Charles L. Crawford
 Brooklyn College: Patricia Earle, Joseph A. Margolis
 Bryn Mawr College: Jeneper P. Shillingford
 Bucknell University: Bruce A. Corrie, Rosalyn K. Ewan, Robert A. Latour
 Buffalo State University College: Howard B. MacAdam
 Buffalo, State University of New York: Norman Baker, Edwin D. Muto
 C. W. Post College: Patricia Lamb Kennedy, Wayne Sunderland
 California University of Pennsylvania: Janice L. McConnell
 Canisius College: Lillian Levey, Daniel P. Starr
 Carnegie-Mellon University: James E. Banner, Joan Maser
 Catholic University: J. Brian McCall
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Frank Lignelli, Frances M. Shope
 Clarkson College of Technology: John W. Hantz
 Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Braden Houston, George D. Langdon Jr., John M. Lefevre, Janet A. Little, V. Martin Scarano
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Paul Fernandes, Marjorie N. Greenberg, Alvin R. Paul
 Cornell University: Martha B. Arnett, Harold Hall, Laing E. Kennedy, Terry R. Mallett
 Cortland State University College: Dolores Bogard, James Clark, Vincent J. Gonino
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Campbell, Scotty Duncan, David M. Nelson, H. R. Raymond
 Delaware State College: Luna I. Mishoe, Nelson E. Townsend
 Dickinson College: David L. Watkins
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Sydney O. Hall
 Drew University: Paul Hardin, Maureen T. Horan, Richard E. Szlasa
 Drexel University: Arthur P. Joblin, John Semanik, Mary F. Semanik
 Duquesne University: Dennis C. Golden, Eileen B. Livingston, Jack Livingston, Rev. Donald S. Nesti
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Dennis D. Bell, Clyde H. Witman
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Foster F. Diebold, Kathleen Lipkovich, James K. McDonald
 Elizabethtown College: D. Kenneth Ober
 Elmira College: Patricia A. Thompson
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Joan Desilets, Robert T. Shields
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Barbara Leshinski, Robert V. Metz, Robert E. Wall, Harvey Winters, Stanley V. Wright
 Fordham University: Joseph J. McGowan Jr., David Rice
 Franklin and Marshall College: Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall
 Fredonia State University College: Patrick R. Damore, Elizabeth Darling
 Gannon University: Howard Elwell
 Geneseo State University College: Robert F. Riedel

George Mason University: George W. Johnson, Jack E. Kvancz, Donald Mash
 George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress, Lloyd H. Elliott, Lynn George, Jeanne Snodgrass, Mary Jo Warner
 Georgetown University: Rev. Timothy Healy, Joseph Lang, Jesse Mann, Nathalie Paramskas, Francis X. Rienzo, William R. Stott Jr.
 Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas
 Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia, Pearl Kowalski
 Hamilton College: Thomas E. Murphy
 Hampton Institute: Ollie Bowman, Oscar L. Prater, Walter L. Lovett, P. LaVerne Sweat
 Hartwick College: Thomas H. Greene
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein, Robert B. Stevens
 Herbert H. Lehman College: Raymond F. Salvestrini
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Michael J. Hanna, Mark E. Hoskins
 Hofstra University: Eve Atkinson, J. R. Block, Robert M. Getchell, James M. Shuart
 Howard University: Henry Jones, Leo F. Miles, Sondra Norrell-Thomas
 Hunter College: Terry A. Wansart
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, Ruth Podbielski, Herman L. Sledzik
 Iona College: Richard Mazzuto
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming
 Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Wallace M. Pina
 Kean College: Hawley C. Waterman
 King's College: John J. Dorish
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Irv Hess, Carol Teske
 La Salle College: Raymond P. Heath
 Lafayette College: David W. Ellis, Olav B. Kollevoll
 Le Moyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.
 Lehigh University: N. Craig Anderson, Judith Baxter, Marsha Duncan, William B. Leckonby, Peter Likins
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Charles A. Eberle, James C. Reeser, Sharon E. Taylor, Craig Dean Willis
 Long Island University: Ann Gulino, J. G. Thompson
 Loyola College (Maryland): Thomas J. O'Connor
 Manhattan College: Jerome Cashman, John J. Powers
 Manhattanville College: Thomas Weingartner
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Richard E. Finley
 Marist College: Dick Quinn
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: James C. Mohr, Richard Watts Jr.
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Leon N. Coursey, Joel C. Mack
 Marywood College: Jane Farr
 Mercyhurst College: William P. Garvey
 Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Gary Reighard, Marjorie A. Trout
 Monmouth College (New Jersey): James Colclough

Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi
 Morgan State University: Thomas Dean
 Muhlenberg College: Ralph A. Kirchenheiter
 Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: John E. Schmid
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York, City College of: Richard Zerneck
 New York, Polytechnic Institute of: Joseph G. Martini
 New York Institute of Technology: William T. Lai
 New York Maritime College: James Migli
 New York University: Daniel E. Quilty
 Niagara University: Rev. Michael J. Shea
 Old Westbury State University College: C. Scully Stikes
 Oneonta State University College: Joseph R. Nichlette, Albert H. Sosa
 Oswego State University College: John L. Spring
 Pennsylvania, University of: Curtis Blake, Charles S. Harris, Carolyn J. Schlie
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Della Durant, Steve A. Garban, Joseph V. Paterno, James I. Tarman
 Pittsburgh, University of: Dean Billick, John O. Bolvin, Edward Bozik, Sandra Bullman, Walter P. Cummins
 Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: Paul Saylor, C. Edward Sherlock
 Potsdam State University College: Conrad A. Bautz
 Princeton University: Samuel C. Howell, Robert J. Myslik, Richard G. Williams
 Ramapo College: Frederick R. Brodzinski, David L. Turnage
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte
 Rider College: John B. Carpenter, Walter L. Wahlen
 Robert Morris College: C. Robert Miller, Robert L. Norberg, Charles L. Sewall
 Rochester, University of: John A. Reeves, Peter Regenstreif
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis W. Spiotti
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Malcolm G. McLaren, Nancy Mitchell, T. Alexander Pond, Paul R. Vitek
 Rutgers University, Newark: Florence A. Labenski, Steven Senko, Gene A. Vincenti
 St. Bonaventure University: Very Rev. Mathias Doyle, Lawrence J. Weiss
 St. Francis College (New York): Carlo Tramontozzi
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Jeffrey J. Quin
 St. John's University (New York): John W. Kaiser
 St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): William Larkin, Michael L. Schultz
 St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon
 St. Peter's College: Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn, William A. Stein
 Salisbury State College: Deane E. Deshon
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
 Seton Hall University: Melvin Knight, Richard J. Regan
 Siena College: William J. Kirsch, Terry J. Reynolds
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane Goss, James G. Pribula
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Bruce G. Boliver, William C. Lennox, Herb F. Reinhard, B. W. Walker

Staten Island, College of: Joseph F. Barresi
 Stony Brook, State University of New York: Paul J. Dudzick, Sandra Weeden
 Susquehanna University: Donald Harnum
 Swarthmore College: Janet S. Dickerson, Eleanor Kay Hess, David B. Smoyer
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, Jake Crouthamel, Dick Gibney, Doris R. Soladay
 Temple University: Ernest C. Casale, Peter J. Liacouras, Joseph W. Marshall, B. J. Sklar, Gavin White Jr.
 Thiel College: James R. Judy
 Towson State University: Hoke L. Smith, Sally Souris, Terry Wanless
 Trenton State College: Harold W. Eickhoff, Roy W. Van Ness
 U.S. Military Academy: Lt. Gen. Willard W. Scott Jr., Carl F. Ullrich
 U.S. Naval Academy: Capt. John O. Coppedge
 Union College (New York): Theodore A. Bick
 Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd
 Utica College: Lansing G. Baker, James A. Spartano
 Vassar College: Richard G. Becker
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto
 Wagner College: Walt Hameline
 Washington and Jefferson College: Paul L. Reardon
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Susan W. Lubking, Richard B. Yoder
 West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, John W. Fisher II, E. Gordon Gee, Fred A. Schaus
 Widener University: William B. Manlove Jr.
 Wilkes College: Gerald E. Hartdagen
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant
 York College (Pennsylvania): Jeff Gamber

District 3

Alabama, University of, in Birmingham: Avie J. Bridges, Pete Derzis, J. Dudley Pewitt, John Jones, Richard L. Miller, Don Young
 Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Sam D. Bailey, Ann Marie Lawler, Richard Thigpen, Joab L. Thomas
 Alabama A&M University: Betty Kelly Austin
 Alabama State University: Leon Howard, Hoyt E. Taylor
 Albany State College (Georgia): Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
 Appalachian State University: Thomas Bohannon, Judy A. Clarke, Jim Garner, Johnny Miller, John E. Thomas
 Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Joseph S. Boland III, John Cochran, Joanna Davenport, L. Oval Jaynes
 Augusta College: George A. Christenberry, Roscoe R. Williams
 Baptist College: W. Howard Bagwell
 Bellarmine College: David O'Toole, James R. Spalding
 Berea College: Joy Hager
 Bethune-Cookman College: Lloyd C. Johnson
 Biscayne College: Joseph T. Hoy
 Bowie State College: John M. Organ Jr.

Bridgewater College (Virginia): Thomas M. Kinder
 Campbell University: Wendell L. Carr, Donald E. Phelps
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, Bill Peterson
 Centre College: Kitty R. Baird
 Christopher Newport College: R. Bev Vaughan
 Citadel, The: Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley, Col. William L. Harris, Edward L. Teague
 Clark College (Georgia): Edward McLean
 Clemson University: Bill L. Atchley, H. C. McLellan, B. J. Skelton
 Columbus College: Francis J. Brooke, Herbert Greene, Billy D. McGee
 Coppin State College: Douglas Robertson
 Davidson College: Edward G. Farrell
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Charlie Capps, Bradford W. Hovious, Kent Wyatt
 Duke University: William D. Bradford, M.D., Tom Butters, Eugene McDonald, Lorraine Woodyard
 East Carolina University: O. Kenneth Karr, Ernest W. Schwarz
 East Tennessee State University: Ronald E. Beller, Janice C. Shelton
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs, Martha Mullins, J. C. Powell
 Elizabeth City State University: Thomas L. Caldwell
 Emory University: Gerald B. Lowrey
 Fayetteville State University: Charles A. Lyons Jr., John D. Marshall Jr.
 Florida, University of: William Carr, Marshall Criser, Richard C. Giannini, Mandell Glicksberg, Robert Q. Marston, Jim Quincy, Marilyn Weiss
 Florida A&M University: Sarah E. Hill, Walter L. Smith, Hansel Tookes, Roosevelt Wilson
 Florida Atlantic University: Jack G. Mehl, Steve Traylor
 Florida International University: Nancy J. Olson
 Florida Southern College: Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Bob Goin, Cecil W. Ingram, Barbara J. Palmer
 Fisk University: John C. Martin
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter
 Frostburg State College: Kenneth Kutler
 Furman University: Francis W. Bonner, Eric Hyman, Dick Sheridan
 Georgia, University of: Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley, Elizabeth Murphey, William M. Powell
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Bernadette McGlade, Joseph M. Pettit, William M. Sangster, Larry Travis
 Georgia Southern College: Henry Schomber, David B. Wagner
 Georgia State University: Noah N. Langdale Jr., William S. Patrick
 Hollins College: Marjorie Berkley, Lanetta Ware
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole
 Jacksonville University: Paul S. Griffin
 James Madison University: Ben L. Carnevale, S. Dean Ehlers, Leotus Morrison, William R. Nelson
 Johns Hopkins University: Lucien M. Brush Jr., Robert H. Scott
 Kentucky, University of: Jerry D. Claiborne, Susan B. Feamster, Clifford O. Hagan, William L. Matthews Jr., Otis A. Singletary
 Kentucky State University: Kenneth D. Gibson
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum

Lane College: Willie G. Shaw
 Liberty Baptist College: Brent Bledsoe, A. Pierre Guillermin, Al Worthington
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green, James P. Pate
 Livingstone College: Fred D. Ponder
 Longwood College: Carolyn V. Hodges
 Louisiana State University: Robert E. Brodhead, Billy M. Seay, James H. Wharton
 Louisville, University of: Burt L. Monroe Jr., William C. Olsen, Donald C. Swain
 Lynchburg College: William H. Shellenberger
 Marshall University: Dorothy E. Hicks, Lynn J. Snyder
 Mary Baldwin College: Lois Blackburn
 Mary Washington College: Edward H. Hegmann
 Maryland, University of, College Park: Randy Hoffman, John B. Slaughter, Charles A. Taff, Suzanne Tyler
 Memphis State University: Charles Cavagnaro, A. Ford Haynes, Billy J. Murphy, Elma Roane
 Mercer University: Barry Myers
 Meredith College: Jay Massey
 Miami, University of (Florida): Edward T. Foote, Sam Jankovich, Harry C. Mallios, Kathy Noble
 Middle Tennessee State University: Jimmy Earle
 Millsaps College: Harper Davis
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Reed Davis, Porter L. Fortune Jr., Langston Rogers, Jeanne Taylor, Max W. Williams
 Mississippi College: John W. Legg, John M. Williams
 Mississippi State University: Elizabeth Birmingham, Donovan D. Horn, Charley Scott
 Morehead State University: G. E. Moran Jr.
 Morris Brown College: Greg Thompson
 Murray State University: Johnny L. Reagan, Kala Stroup
 New Orleans, University of: Ronald J. Maestri, Jessie O. Snowden Jr.
 Nicholls State University: Don Landry
 Norfolk State University: William L. Archie, Ola A. Goss
 North Alabama, University of: John E. Kingsbury, Roy S. Stevens
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Charles L. Carr, Christopher Fordham, Benson R. Wilcox, M.D.
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: E. K. Fretwell, Doug Orr, Thomas C. Turner, Clyde L. Walker
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: Nelson E. Bobb
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks
 North Carolina A&T State University: Edward B. Fort, Orby Moss Jr., James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Henry C. Lattimore, Lindsey A. Merritt, Sandra T. Shuler
 North Carolina State University: Willis R. Casey, Nora Lynn Finch, Richard D. Mochrie, Bruce R. Poulton, Frank Weedon
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas Kearns
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, John Moore
 Pembroke State University: Lacey E. Gane, Paul R. Givens
 Radford University: Donald N. Dedmon, Chuck Taylor

Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Ladell Payne
 Randolph-Macon Woman's College: Robert A. Spivey
 Richmond, University of: Charles S. Boone, E. Bruce Heilman
 Roanoke College: Edgar L. Green
 Rollins College: Edward E. Borsoi, Gordon E. Howell
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Julian L. Smith, Jo Ann Williams
 St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye
 St. Paul's College: Joseph E. Thompson
 Samford University: H. Evan Zeiger
 Savannah State College: Frank Ellis Jr.
 Shaw University: Stanley H. Smith
 South, University of the: Horace Moore
 South Alabama, University of: James H. Boyd, Joe Gottfried
 South Carolina, University of: John T. Moore, William F. Putnam
 South Carolina State College: Oscar P. Butler Jr., Willis C. Ham, M. Maceo Nance Jr.
 South Florida, University of: John Lott Brown, Stewart W. Schneller, John Wadas
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Leo P. Jones, Felix Laiche
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Bobby Chain, Roland H. Dale, Aubrey K. Lucas, Pete Taylor, Sidney E. Weatherford
 Southern University, New Orleans: Artis M. Davenport
 Southwestern College (Tennessee): George Lapides
 Stetson University: Pope A. Duncan, Fred H. Cooper, H. Douglas Lee
 Stillman College: Richard Cosby
 Tampa, University of: Robert M. Birrenkott, Richard D. Cheshire
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Sharon Fanning, Frederick W. Obear, Harold B. Wilkes
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Joan Cronan, Andrew J. Kozar, H. Alan Lasiter, John Majors, George R. Woodruff
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Ramon A. Mears, Charles E. Smith
 Tennessee State University: Sterlin N. Adams, Julia M. Dinkins, Frederick S. Humphries, John Robert E. Lee
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David W. Coffey, Arliss L. Roaden
 Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Robert E. Stewart
 Tulane University: Elizabeth B. Delery, Eamon Kelly, Richard D. Lumsden, Hindman Wall
 Tuskegee Institute: Howard Davis
 Valdosta State College: Joe A. Gore
 Vanderbilt University: George Bennett, Emily H. Harsh, Paul Harrawood, Ken Hudgens, Roy Kramer, Joe B. Wyatt
 Virginia, University of: Richard D. Schultz, D. Alan Williams
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Robert H. Johnston, Lewis B. Mills, Elizabeth S. Royster
 Virginia Military Institute: John G. Barrett, Tom Joynes, Gen. Sam S. Walker
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: William G. Dooley, Jo K. Kafer, William B. Matthews, James I. Robertson Jr.
 Virginia State University: Roosevelt Cunningham

Virginia Union University: Willard Bailey
 Wake Forest University: Dorothy Casey, Thomas K. Hearn, Gene Hooks, John W. Sawyer
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry
 Washington College (Maryland): Edward L. Athey
 West Georgia College: Jimmy C. Stokes
 Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Betty J. Peele, Harold F. Robinson, Robert L. Waters
 Western Kentucky University: John D. Minton, Jim Richards, Donald W. Zacharias
 Western Maryland College: Richard A. Clower
 William and Mary, College of: James Copeland, Mildred B. West, Lawrence L. Wiseman
 Winston-Salem State University: Clarence E. Gaines

District 4

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson
 Albion College: Frank Joranko
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling
 Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell
 Aurora College: Sam S. Bedrosian
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone, Marcia French
 Ball State University: Don Purvis, Andrea Seger, George E. Swafford, Dwight D. Wallace
 Bowling Green State University: John C. Gregory, Carole J. Huston, Marvin L. Kumler, Phil Mason, Paul J. Olscamp
 Butler University: William L. Sylvester, Mary Ann Wiedenmann
 Calvin College: Anthony J. Diekema, David B. Tuuk
 Capital University: Armin P. Langholz, Lee A. Sadler
 Carleton College: Patricia Lamb
 Carroll College: DeWayne King
 Carthage College: August R. Schmidt
 Case Western Reserve University: J. William Grice
 Central Michigan University: Theodore Kjolhede, Fran Koenig, Douglas W. Nance
 Central State University (Ohio): Jerome Quarterman
 Chicago, University of: Mary Jean Mulvaney, Rosalie Resch
 Chicago State University: Dale R. Jackson
 Cincinnati, University of: Michael B. McGee, Gordon S. Skinner, Jean E. Tuerck
 Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey, Merle J. Levin, Walter B. Waetjen
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Robert J. Nick
 Dayton, University of: Thomas J. Frericks, Dennis Gerdeman
 Denison University: Theodore H. Barclay, F. Trevor Gamble, Cheryl Marra
 DePaul University: James Doyle, Jean M. Lenti, Edward J. Manetta
 DePauw University: Thomas A. Mont
 Detroit, University of: Brad Kinsman
 Eastern Illinois University: Jimmie Franklin, R. C. Johnson, Ron Paap, Joan K. Schmidt

Eastern Michigan University: John Fountain, George Linn, Lucy Parker,
 Paul A. Shoults, Eugene Smith
 Elmhurst College: Allen F. Ackerman
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, J. Robert Knott
 Ferris State College: Thomas G. Cook, Dean Davenport, Kathy J. DeBoer
 Grand Valley State College: Joan Boand, Arend D. Lubbers, George M.
 MacDonald
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist
 Hiram College: Donald Charlton
 Hope College: Raymond E. Smith
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: Alyce Cheska, John E. Koenig, Karol
 Anne Kahrs, John E. Nowak
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Ben Nowakowski, William Roetzheim
 Illinois Benedictine College: Anthony L. LaScala
 Illinois College: E. Joe Brooks
 Illinois State University: Vernon Adams, Daniel Ghormley, Linda G.
 Herman, Twyman Jones, Donna Taylor, Jo Workman
 Indiana Central University: Kenneth Borden, William A. Bright
 Indiana State University, Evansville: Donald Bennett
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Anita Aldrich, Ralph N. Floyd, Isabella
 Hutchison, Elizabeth Kurpius, Jack R. Wentworth
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: David R. Skelton
 Iowa, University of: Samuel L. Becker, N. Peggy Burke, Larry Bruner,
 Christine Grant, Chalmers W. Elliott, Gary Kurdelmeier, Fred Mims,
 Bonnie Slatton
 John Carroll University: James M. Lavin, Gerald J. Schweickert
 Kalamazoo College: Rolla L. Anderson
 Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Gordon Anderson, Doris F.
 Chambers, Judy Devine, William E. Shelton
 Kenyon College: Jeffrey Vennell
 Lake Erie College: Diana Morea
 Lake Forest College: Michael E. Dau
 Lake Superior State College: Ronald R. Cooper
 Lawrence University: Ronald D. Roberts
 Lewis University: Dennis F. Rio, Paul Ruddy
 Loyola University (Illinois): Loyal K. Park, Samuel D. Ramenofsky
 Macalester College: Thomas Hosier
 Marquette University: Walter W. Fredricks, Henry C. Raymonds
 Miami University (Ohio): Charles Heimsch, Paul G. Pearson, Richard
 G. Shrider, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, Gwendolyn S. Cruzat, Paul
 W. Gikas, Don Lund, Phyllis M. Ocker, Glenn Schembechler
 Michigan State University: Kathy Lindahl, Cecil Mackey, Gwendolyn
 Norrell, Douglas W. Weaver
 Michigan Technological University: K. Ross Johnson, Ted Kearly
 Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Bruce McLeod, Dennis Nelson
 Minnesota, University of, Morris: Willis R. Kelly
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: Merrily Dean Baker, Elayne M.
 Donahue, Gary Engstrand, Robert J. Geary, Jo-Ida Hanson, M. Catherine
 Mathison, Robert A. Stein, Charles Walcott, Frank B. Wilderson

Mount Union College: Truman D. Turnquist
 North Central College: Russell J. Poel, Dennis Ryan
 North Park College: William A. Anderson
 Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Susie Pembroke-Jones,
 Richard J. Smith, Nancy M. Vedral
 Northern Michigan University: James Appleberry, Gil Canale, Thomas
 Knauss, Barbara Patrick, R. Thomas Peters Jr.
 Northwestern University: Richard J. Cortez, Fred Hemke, Ken Kraft,
 Sandra McCullough, Doug Single
 Notre Dame, University of: Brian Boulac, Eugene F. Corrigan, Astrid E.
 Hotvedt, Rev. Edmund P. Joyce
 Oakland University: Paul E. Hartman, Glenn A. Jackson
 Oberlin College: Mary J. Culhane, Joseph W. Gurtis Jr., Larry D. Shinn
 Ohio Northern University: Herbert N. Strayer
 Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, Hugh D. Hindman, James L. Jones,
 C. J. Slanicka, Joanne S. Stevenson, Larry R. Thompson
 Ohio University: John F. Burns, Robert Kline, Anne McClanahan, Harold
 N. McElhaney, Charles J. Ping, Peggy Pruitt
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Jack D. Fouts
 Otterbein College: Terri Hazucha, Elmer W. Yoest
 Purdue University: Gilbert S. Banker, Buford H. Byers, George S. King Jr.,
 Carol Mertler
 Rockford College: William F. Lanston, Joel W. Tibbetts
 St. Norbert College: Albert E. Negratti
 St. Olaf College: Robert D. Gelle
 St. Thomas, College of: Frank Mach
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: James R. Buck, Pam Gunsten,
 Cindy Jones
 Toledo, University of: Glen R. Driscoll, Vernon M. Smith, Charles Snyder,
 John W. Stoepler, Marnie Swift
 Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig, William L. Steinbrecher
 Wabash College: Robert L. Henry, Lewis S. Salter
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Dorothy E. Dreyer, Fred A. Mulhauser,
 Christ Petrouleas
 Western Illinois University: Marion Blackinton, Kristine Freck, Leslie
 Malpass, James E. McKinney, Gil Peterson, Ralph H. Wagoner
 Western Michigan University: John T. Bernhard, Chauncey J. Brinn,
 Christine W. Hoyles, Leo C. VanderBeek, Tom H. Wonderling
 Wheaton College (Illinois): David E. Johnston, Tony Ladd
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Donald Harden, Charles A. Ihrke
 Wisconsin, University of, LaCrosse: E. William Vickroy
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Otto Breitenbach, Frank J. Remington,
 Kit Saunders
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Paul A. Haubrich, Daryl A. Leonard
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Helen Briwa, James J. Flood
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Wayne E. Dannehl, Alan E. Guskin
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: George Chryst
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Virgil Thiesfeld
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Warren C. Bowlus, Orville Nelson
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Willie Myers

Wittenberg University: Linda Arena, Ralph D. Lenz, Dave Maurer, Robert E. Rosencrans
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, Alvin J. Van Wie
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Michael Ferrari, Susan E. Gayle, Gordon L. Wise, Peggy Wynkoop
 Xavier University: Rev. Charles L. Currie, Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Earl J. Kronenberger
 Youngstown State University: Lawrence Looby, Joe Malmisur

District 5

Augustana College (South Dakota): Virg Sandvig
 Bradley University: Martin G. Abegg, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
 Buena Vista College: Darrell J. Peck
 Central College (Iowa): Ronald Schipper, Kenneth J. Weller
 Central Missouri State University: Jerry Hughes, Bill Stucker, Floyd A. Walker
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn
 Cornell College (Iowa): Jerry Clark
 Creighton University: Robert J. Gerraughty, Mary Higgins, Ross Horning, Daniel J. Offenburger
 Drake University: James A. Adams, Robert D. Karnes, Betty Miles, Wilbur C. Miller
 Grinnell College: John A. Pfitsch
 Indiana State University, Terre Haute: Alpha Cleary, Bernard F. Cooper, John C. Jessell, Richard G. Landini
 Iowa State University: John P. Mahlstede, Max Urick
 Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Monte C. Johnson, Lonny Rose
 Kansas State University: Robert R. Snell, Dick Towers, Kathy Treadway
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Charles M. Hoard, Yvonne Hoard, Lucius Jones
 Luther College: Betty A. Hoff, Paul Solberg
 Mankato State University: Joe Farnham, Margaret R. Preska, John Sanford-Reinbold, John R. Taylor
 Maryville College (Missouri): David R. Pierce
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Dick Bestwick, Joe Castiglione, Jean Cerra-Decker, Dave Hart, Henry T. Lowe, Paul A. Miller
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Billy A. Key
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Charles Smith, Fred Wilke
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: June B. Davis, Robert S. Devaney, James O'Hanlon
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie Claussen, Don Leahy, Larry Trussell
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Orson L. Christensen, Arthur C. Nicolai
 North Dakota, University of: Carl R. Miller, George W. Schubert, Helen Smiley
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, David Forbes, Ade L. Sponberg
 Northeast Missouri State University: Walter H. Ryle
 Northern Colorado, University of: Rosemary Fri, Robert L. Heiny, Robert A. Oliver

Northern Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowlsby, John Jermier, Dixon L. Riggs, Sandra Williamson
 Northwest Missouri State University: Richard R. Flanagan, John P. Mees, Sherri Reeves
 Oklahoma, University of: Daniel G. Gibbens, R. Gerald Turner, Wade H. Walker
 Oklahoma City University: Arnold Short
 Oklahoma State University: Ann A. Baer, Gerald M. Lage, Myron Roderick
 Oral Roberts University: Larry Cochell
 St. Cloud State University: Brendan J. McDonald, Noel W. Olson
 St. Louis University: Lawrence S. Aceo, Albert E. Bender Sr.
 Simpson College: Gordon Jeppson
 South Dakota, University of: Jack Doyle, George R. Horner, Mary Mock
 South Dakota State University: Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson, Ruth Marske
 Southeast Missouri State University: Alton Bray, Marvin Rosengarten
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, Lew Hartzog, Margaret Matthias, Albert Somit, Charlotte West
 Southwest Missouri State University: Larry L. George, James W. Greer, Bill Rowe Jr., Mary Jo Wynn
 Tulsa, University of: John Cooper, Bradley E. Place, Emery Turner
 Wartburg College: John F. Kurt
 Washington University (Missouri): Chuck Gordon, Harry Kisker, John Schael
 West Texas State University: Don W. Davis, Leon Trekell
 Wichita State University: Kathryn Bunnell, Lewis Perkins, Martin M. Perline, Richard I. Stephenson, Kevin Weiberg

District 6

Abilene Christian University: Garvin Beauchamp, Wally Bullington
 Alcorn State University: Marino H. Casem, Norris Allen Edney, Walter Washington
 Angelo State University: Phil George, Lloyd D. Vincent
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Ruth Cohoon, Albert M. Witte
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Happy Mahfouz
 Arkansas State University: Bill Davidson, Sam R. Gennuso, Larry Lacewell, Ray Thornton, Kay Woodiel
 Baylor University: Edwin P. Horner, Bill Menefee
 Bishop College: James L. Jones, Wright L. Lassiter Jr., Myrtle Robinson
 Centenary College: Walt Stevens Jr., David E. Thomas, Donald A. Webb
 East Texas State University: Moses Attrep Jr., Charles J. Austin, Ernest Hawkins
 Grambling State University: Patricia D. Bibbs, Joseph B. Johnson, Burnett Joiner, Eddie M. Jones
 Hardin-Simmons University: L. Ross Johnson
 Houston, University of: Thomas J. Ford, Michael T. Johnson, John V. Kasser, Linda Lindloff, Pat Younger
 Houston Baptist University: Edward S. Billings
 Howard Payne University: William D. Hicks

Jackson State University: Walter Reed
 Lamar University: James B. Higgins, Sonny Jolly, C. Robert Kemble, Dan Rogas
 Louisiana Tech University: Sonja S. Hogg, Harold J. Smolinski, Bob Vanatta
 McNeese State University: Jack V. Doland, Joseph E. Duplechin, Charley W. Sparks
 Mississippi Valley State University: Joe L. Boyer, James C. Coleman, Reginal L. Henderson
 North Texas State University: Irma Caton, Alfred F. Hurley, Fred McCain, Kathy McCann, Walt Parker
 Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard Dolecheck, Benny Hollis
 Northwestern State University (Louisiana): Tynes Hildebrand
 Pan American University: Ronald Applbaum, Miguel A. Nevarez
 Prairie View A&M University: Marion Henry, Brutus N. Jackson
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, August Erfurth Jr., Norman Hackerman, Martha E. Hawthorne
 Sam Houston State University: Ron Randleman
 Southern Methodist University: Barbara Camp, Robert L. Hitch, John E. Kennedy, Dudley Parker, L. Donald Shields, Doug Smith, John D. Twining
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Richard A. Hill, Jesse N. Stone Jr.
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft, Gordon McCullough, Vernon McDonald, Bill M. Miller
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Sherry LeBas, Terry Don Phillips, Gerard L. St. Martin
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Sadie Allison, Dianne Baker, Jim Hess, Harold G. Hill, William R. Johnson, Steve McCarty, Baker Patillo
 Texas, University of, Arlington: John J. Haynes, William E. Reeves
 Texas, University of, Austin: Ronald M. Brown, Isabella Cunningham, DeLoss Dodds, Donna A. Lopiano, L. O. Morgan, W. O. Shultz II
 Texas, University of, San Antonio: Rudy Davalos, Daniel O. Hogenauer, James W. Wagener
 Texas A&I University: Billy J. Franklin, Fred Nuesch
 Texas A&M University: T. W. Adair, Terry Condon, John David Crow, Kay Don, Kristen Douglass, Charles H. Samson, Jackie Sherrill, Frank E. Vandiver
 Texas Christian University: Tom F. Badgett, Carolyn Dixon, Mel Thomas, Frank Windeger
 Texas Southern University: Dave Bethany, James Race Jr., Calvin O. White
 Texas Tech University: John Conley, Jeannine McHaney, Ginger Nicholas, Robert M. Sweazy
 Texas Woman's University: Mary Evelyn Huey, Joanne Kuhn, Jan Rintala, Kim Shibinski, G. Ann Uhler, Frank Vitro
 Trinity University (Texas): George N. Boyd, Robert Hockey

District 7

Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Norman F. Dahm, Carol Ladwig
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu Wallace
 Colorado College: Susan A. Ashley

Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: Thurman F. McGraw, Nancy J. O'Connor, Harry E. Troxell
 Denver, University of: Anthony R. Cillo, Terrance Toy, Diane T. Wendt
 Eastern Montana College: Elwood B. Hahn
 Gonzaga University: Robert C. Branch, Dan Fitzgerald
 Hawaii, University of: Ted Livingston, Cindy Mazda, Stanley B. Sheriff
 Idaho, University of: William S. Belknap, Kathy Clark, W. Hal Godwin
 Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Myron L. Coulter, Kathy Hildreth
 Metropolitan State College: William Helman
 Montana, University of: Neil Bucklew, Evan Denney, Harley Lewis, Barbara B. Hollmann
 Montana State University: Edward L. Hanson, Virginia Hunt, Tom Parac
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Joseph N. Crowley, Richard M. Trachok
 New Mexico, University of: John D. Bridgers, Linda K. Estes, Marvin D. Johnson
 Northern Arizona University: Frank H. Besnette, Linda S. French, Eugene M. Hughes, Sam F. McClanahan
 Regis College (Colorado): Christopher Dittman
 San Diego State University: Gene Bourdet, Marilyn Hatcher, Mary Alice Hill, James G. Malik, Gabriel Ortiz
 Southern Colorado, University of: Robert W. Mullen
 Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns, Bill Cords
 U.S. Air Force Academy: Col. John J. Clune, Micki King Hogue, Col. Harvey Schiller
 Utah, University of: C. Arnold Ferrin Jr., Fern Gardner, R. J. Snow
 Weber State College: Gary T. Crompton, Dean W. Hurst, W. Blair Low
 Wyoming, University of: Mary Ellen Cloninger, Gary Cunningham, Joseph R. Geraud

District 8

Alaska, University of, Anchorage: David L. Outcalt, Gene A. Templeton
 Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: Edwin W. Lawrence, Karen J. Morris, Patrick J. O'Rourke, Harris Shelton, Theresa H. Tomczak
 Arizona, University of: Cedric W. Dempsey, Mary Roby, Robert W. Sankey
 Arizona State University: Pat Kuehner, J. Russell Nelson, Milton R. Schroeder, Richard P. Tamburo
 Bakersfield, California State University: Rudy Carvajal, George B. Hibbard, Joseph Julian
 California, University of, Berkeley: Luella J. Lilly, David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr.
 California, University of, Davis: Hubert Heitman Jr., Samuel H. Logan, Joe L. Singleton
 California, University of, Irvine: John E. Caine, Linda B. Dempsay, Robert L. Halvaks
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter T. Dalis, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, Jim Milhorn, John Sandbrook, Charles E. Young

California, University of, Riverside; Chris Rinne, James J. Sims
 California, University of, San Diego: Judith M. Sweet
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Edward Birch, Kenneth E. Droscher, Alice Henry
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Richard Heaton
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: James Bell, Jack B. Frost, Karen L. Miller
 Chapman College: Walter Bowman, Mike Weathers
 Chico, California State University: Don Miller
 Claremont Men's-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: John Zinda
 Dominguez Hills, California State University: Susan A. Carberry, Harold Charnofsky, Donald R. Gerth, Dan Guerrero
 Eastern Washington University: H. George Frederickson, Ron Raver, Mary Bubright
 Fresno, California State University: Allen Agnew, Jack Lengyel, Diane Milutinovich
 Fullerton, California State University: Jewel Plummer Cobb, Leanne Grotke, Patrick A. Wegner
 Hayward, California State University: Judith L. Hirsch, Alfred R. Mathews
 Long Beach, California State University: Glendon F. Drake, Cynthia Hill, Stephen Horn, Keith I. Polakoff, Corey Van Fleet
 Los Angeles, California State University: Dennis J. Keihn, Michael Moode, Neil Rabitoy
 Loyola Marymount University: Robert D. Arias, Henry Durand, Margaret Olaveson
 Mills College: Robert Driscoll
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: James H. Frey, Leonard E. Goodall, Richard L. Harp, Christina L. Kunzer, Bradley L. Rothermel
 New Mexico State University: Keith Colson, Karen Fey, Del Wells
 Northridge, California State University: Judith M. Brame, James W. Cleary, Robert J. Hiebert, James Sefton, John J. Templin
 Occidental College: Richard C. Gilman, Lynn M. Pacala
 Oregon, University of: Richard M. Bay, Chapin Clark, Chris Voelz
 Oregon State University: Dee G. Andros, John R. Davis, Sylvia L. Moore
 Pacific, University of: Stanley E. McCaffrey, S. Thomas Stubbs, Stanley Volbrecht
 Pepperdine University: Wayne Wright
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan, Curtis W. Tong
 Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: Robert L. Casteel, Zola Dunbar, Roy L. Love
 Puget Sound, University of: Jack Ecklund
 Redlands, University of: Frank Serrao, Pam Walker
 Sacramento, California State University: Robert T. Olmstead Jr., Irene Shea
 St. Mary's College (California): Donald J. McKillip, William D. McLeod
 San Diego, University of: Thomas F. Burke, Rev. Patrick Cahill
 San Francisco, University of: Sandee L. Hill, Rev. Robert A. Sunderland
 San Jose State University: David H. Adams, John Brazil, Gail Fullerton, Charles Whitcomb, Mary M. Zimmerman
 Santa Clara, University of: Marygrace Colby, George P. Malley
 Seattle Pacific University: Wesley E. Lingren, Keith R. Phillips

Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey
 Southern California, University of: John A. Barrett, Margaret Gatz, Barbara Hedges, Richard H. Perry, Jon C. Strauss
 Stanford University: Jack Friedenthal, Ferdinand A. Geiger, Pamela Strathairn
 Stanislaus, California State College: Jim Hanny
 U.S. International University: Al J. Palmiotto
 Utah State University: Kaye Hart, Norman B. Jones, David Kragthorpe
 Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, Richard Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Don James, Milo R. Lude
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Marcia L. Sanholtz, Richard A. Young
 Whittier College: David A. Jacobs

Associate Members

[None]

Allied Members

Association of Mid-Continent Universities: F. L. Ferzacca
 Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James, John A. Fuzak
 Atlantic 10 Conference: Leland Byrd
 Big East Conference: David R. Gavitt, Linda M. Bruno
 Big Eight Conference: Carl C. James, Prentice Gautt
 Big Sky Conference: Ronald D. Stephenson
 Big Ten Conference: Wayne Duke, John D. Dewey, Phyllis L. Howlett, Clarence Underwood Jr.
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan
 Central Collegiate Hockey Association*: Jim Ruehl
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bob Moorman, Bishop M. Patterson
 College Athletic Conference: Walter Bryant
 College Football Association*: Charles M. Neinas
 East Coast Conference: D. J. DiJulia
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Robert M. Whitelaw, George R. Bisacca, Clayton W. Chapman
 Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference: Patricia Viverito
 Gulf South Conference: Hayden Riley
 Heartland Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 High Country Athletic Conference: Margie McDonald
 Ivy League: James M. Litvack
 Lone Star Conference: Shirley Morton
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: F. Paul Bogan
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Jim McDermott, David Lehn
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Steven Hatchell, Jim Haney
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
 Mid-Continent Conference*: F. L. Ferzacca
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: William Marshall, Robert R. Davidson
 Midwestern City Conference: Cecil N. Coleman

*Nonvoting

Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Jo Ann Andregg
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
 Missouri Valley Conference: Richard D. Martin, Jeff Hurd
 Mountain West Athletic Conference: Sharon M. Holmberg
 New England Collegiate Conference: Francis W. Poisson
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: R. D. Halford
 North Star Conference: R. Elaine Dreidame
 Northeast-Eight Conference: Elwood N. Shields
 Northern California Athletic Conference: Frank B. Jones
 Northern Pacific Athletic Conference: Beth J. Bricker, Joan Parker
 Ohio Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
 Ohio Valley Conference: James E. Delany
 Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Lewis A. Cryer, Dennis A. Farrell
 Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Wiles Hallock, David Price
 Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Donald G. Kelley
 Southeastern Conference: H. Boyd McWhorter, Robert M. Barrett, James McCullough, Suzanne Stogner, Mark Womack
 Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: David A. Jacobs
 Southern Conference: Kenneth G. Germann
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Howard Davis, James E. Hawkins
 Southland Conference: Dick Oliver, Don Graham, Margie Hinton
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Fred Jacoby, Dutch Baughman, Harold W. Lahar
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank
 Sun Belt Conference: Victor A. Bubas
 Trans America Athletic Conference: Louis G. McCullough
 West Coast Athletic Conference: Michael M. Gilleran
 Western Athletic Conference: Joseph L. Kearney, Hale McMenamin
 Western Collegiate Athletic Association: Terri Riffe
 Western Football Conference*: Victor A. Buccola
 Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Kitty R. Baird

*Nonvoting

Affiliated Members

American Football Coaches Association: Charles McClendon
 College Swimming Coaches of America: Corey Van Fleet
 Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association: Alfred R. Mathews
 National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics: Sally N. Jones
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Timothy W. Gleason
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Richard Kazmaier, James McDowell
 NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association: Robert Ehrhart
 United States Women's Lacrosse Association: Lanetta Ware
 University Commissioners Association: Cecil N. Coleman
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes

Visitors

Advanced Technology, Inc.: Ted Bartell, J. Ward Keesling

Amateur Basketball Association of the USA: William L. Wall
 American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers: Cliff Sjogren
 American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Richard Novak
 American Council on Education: Robert Aaron, Robert H. Atwell, Diana Cecil, William G. Kroger, Jane Lichtman, J. W. Peltason, Albert Schwartz, Sheldon E. Steinbach
 Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer
 Baltimore, University of: Frank Szymanski
 Barry University: Eddie A. Coletti, Gary D. Smith
 Bronx Community College: Roscoe C. Brown Jr.
 California Bowl: Robert Schumacher
 Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union: Robert W. Pugh
 Champlain College: Don R. Gerber
 Eastern New Mexico University: B. B. Lees
 Fiesta Bowl: Bob Davies, Don Meyers, Bruce Skinner
 Florida Citrus Bowl: Chuck Rohe
 Gator Bowl: George Olsen
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: H. D. Peterson
 Greater New Orleans Tourist and Convention Commission: Sallee Pavlovich
 Gulf Star Conference: Dave Waples
 Guthrie, R. Claire; Washington, D.C.
 Hall of Fame Bowl: Luke Crawford, Jim Simmons
 Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic: Joe Auth, Ted Dimauso, Ed Keating, William Sullivan, Dan Walsh
 Iowa Lakes Community College: Dan Summy
 Jacka, William M.; Birmingham, Alabama
 Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley
 Meadowlands: Leslie H. Unger
 Montevallo, University of: Jim Vickrey
 National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges: Susan Fratkan
 National Invitation Tournament: Peter A. Carlesimo
 National Junior College Athletic Association: Theo Heap, George E. Killian
 National Strength/Conditioning Association: Keith Kephart
 New Orleans Hilton Hotel: Michael Beardsley
 New Orleans Marriott Hotel: George A. Muro
 Opryland Hotel: Steve Bartolin
 Orange Bowl Committee: Bob Lafferty, Stephen A. Lynch
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: Jim Boyle, Bob Cheney, Millard Davidson, Stan Hahn, William Nicholas, Fred Soldwedel, Art Welsh
 Projects West: Diane Engelken
 Purdue University, Calumet: John Friend
 Skidmore College: Tim Brown
 Sugar Bowl: Mickey Holmes, Elliott Laudeman
 Sun Bowl: Thomas R. Starr
 West Florida, University of: Kenneth L. Curtis
 Whitman College: Craig Gunsul
 Winthrop College: Doug Echols

Working News Media

ABC Sports: Donn Bernstein, Sherry Kozloff
 Associated Press: Denne Freeman, Herschel Nissenson, Doug Tucker
 Austin American-Statesman: Brad Buchholz
 Boston Globe: Ian Thomsen
 Bradley Photographers: James T. Bradley, Joe Collins
 CBS Radio: Dick Brescia, Frank Miller
 CBS Sports: Mark Carlson, Len DeLuca, Kevin O'Malley, Neal Pilson, Peter Tortorici
 Cable News Network: Susan Reid
 Cablesports: Dantia Quirk
 Christian Science Monitor: Bob Kilborn
 Chronicle of Higher Education: John A. Crowl, Sherry Katz, N. Scott Vance
 Cincinnati Post: Pat Harmon
 College Press Service: Dale Rice
 Corpus Christi Caller-Times: Tom Kleikner
 Daily Oklahoman: Jerry McConnell, Volney Meece
 Dallas Morning News: Mark Blaudschun, Howard Castleberry, Tim Cowlshaw, Cathy Harasta, Ray Najami, Kevin Newberry
 Dallas Times-Herald: Bob Galt, Danny Robbins, Phil Rogers, Jack Sheppard, Blackie Sherrod
 ESPN: Steve Bornstein, Loren Matthews, Fred Miller, Dave Ogrian
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Jim Laise, Dick Madel
 Gannett News Service: Mike Lopresti
 Gator Bowl: Ted Emery
 Higher Education Daily: Greg McCaffery
 Higher Education and National Affairs: Bill Kroger
 Home Sports Entertainment: Larry Herrera, Greg Maiuro
 Host Communications, Inc.: Dick Gabriel
 Houston Chronicle: Eddie Sefko
 Houston Post: Melanie Hauser
 KXAS: Adam Mallory, Kerry Smith
 KDFW-TV: Bud Gillett, Tom Quinn
 KRLD: Brian Briscoe
 Kansas City Star: Steve Richardson
 Knoxville News-Sentinel: Al Browning
 Las Vegas Sun: Keith Tift
 MacNeil-Lehrer News: Kwame Holman, Bill McMillin, Patti Parson, Jim Van Vranken
 Memphis Showboats: Charles J. Thornton
 MetroSports: Lenny Klompus, Jules Winn
 NBC News: Bob Eshbaugh, Henry Kokojan, Lee McCarthy, Clarence Renshaw
 NBC Sports: Rich Hussey
 Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
 New York Times: Gordon White
 Newsday: Manny Topol
 Orange County Register: Michele Himmelberg
 QV Publishing: Rick Kulis, George Schulman
 Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander
 Raycom, Inc.: Dee Ray, Rick Ray

Rice University: Bill Whitmore
 Salt Lake Tribune: John Mooney
 San Diego Union: Chris Jenkins
 Sports Illustrated: Wilmer Ames, Bill Colson, John Garrity
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Gus Manning
 Texas, University of, Austin: Gerry Grouzulis, Roger White
 Texas A&I University: Fred Neusch
 Tucson Citizen: Corky Simpson
 Turner Broadcasting System, Inc.: Terry Hanson
 U.S. News & World Report: Joseph Renshaw
 USA Today: Steve Wieberg
 United Press International: Dwayne Cox
 WBAP: Scott Volpe
 WFAX: Jack Murray, George Riba
 WGBH: Hector Calan, Mamie Campbell, Steve Currus, Harry Edwards, Merle R. Eisman, Larry LeCain, Nick Parker
 Waco Citizen: Bill Holmes
 Waco Tribune Herald: Dave Campbell

DIVISION I-A ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 9, 1984

The Division I-A round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8:10 a.m. Monday, January 9, in the Chantilly Ballroom of the Loews Anatole Hotel. NCAA Secretary-Treasurer John R. Davis, Oregon State University, presided.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussions. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Prior to the discussion of proposed legislation, Mr. Davis presented a series of general announcements concerning Convention procedures and reviewed the purposes of the round table, noting that it marked the first time that separate round tables had been conducted for the three segments of Division I. Throughout the session, Mr. Davis reported on parliamentary relationships between certain proposals, as well as on known amendments to the proposed amendments.

Division I-A Issues

Roy Kramer of Vanderbilt University, a member of the Select Committee on Athletic Problems and Concerns in Higher Education, explained Proposal No. 49, which would move the limitation on a grant-in-aid from the constitution to the bylaws, noting that each division for the first time would have the opportunity to deal with that issue separately.

It was explained that the two-year period specified in Proposal No. 61 (permitting 40 initial football awards in such a period in Division I-A football) would be a moving two-year period, rather than set two-year periods.

Chair Davis clarified Proposal No. 140, explaining that multiple off-campus practice sites would be permitted under that proposal if each were used regularly by the institution.

Other Legislation

Mr. Davis stated that the women's skiing limitation of seven grants, as set forth in Proposal No. 7, merely verified an existing interpretation, issued earlier by the NCAA Council, that the women's limitation in a sport for which no limitation had been acted upon by an NCAA Convention would be the same as the existing limitation for men in that sport.

Robert F. Steidel Jr., chair of the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee, explained that the reference to "a regularly matriculated, degree-seeking student" in Proposal No. 1 represented an attempt to affirm the existing circumstance under NCAA legislation and to assure that the definition was specific. It was emphasized that there was no intention to affect a member institution's percentage exceptions to its customary admissions requirements.

The University of Texas, Austin, announced that it would attempt to refer Proposal No. 17 to committee.

It was announced that amendments would be submitted to clarify Proposal Nos. 25, 27, 28 and 29. In the cases of Nos. 27 and 28, it was emphasized that the intent was to require transfers from two-year colleges to meet the same satisfactory-progress requirements upon enrollment in an NCAA member institution as they would have had to meet had they been enrolled in the member institution as freshmen and sophomores.

Charles E. Young, chancellor of the University of California, Los Angeles, explained his institution's rationale for proposing No. 30, a resolution calling for legislation to be submitted at the 1985 Convention to declare freshmen ineligible for varsity competition and practice in football and basketball at Division I institutions. He opined that his support of the proposal represented "a futile pitch" but stressed his belief that it is not in the best interest of college freshmen to subject them to the demands of major programs in football and basketball.

Supporters of Proposal No. 35, to establish a Board of Presidents, and No. 36, to create an NCAA Presidents' Commission, requested support for those proposals. Chancellor Young also outlined several amendments that would be submitted to No. 35. Division I Vice-President Gwendolyn Norrell reported that the Council would sponsor a resolution to permit the proposed Presidents' Commission to designate roll-call votes on specific issues at an NCAA Convention, and Mr. Davis explained that electronic voting procedures were being investigated to facilitate roll-call voting. In response to a question, President Stephen Horn, California State University, Long Beach, stated that the proposed Board of Presidents (No. 35) could suspend a Convention action, but if the suspension subsequently were overturned by the next Convention, the Board could not suspend it again.

The Big Ten Conference reported that Proposal No. 53 was intended to be permissive, enabling an institution to award a student-athlete five years of financial aid over a six-year period.

The Women's Basketball Coaches Association expressed its strong support for Proposal No. 102, prohibiting on- and off-campus recruiting contacts in Division I women's basketball during that division's women's basketball championship.

Supporters of Proposal No. 109, which would require Division I members to sponsor a minimum of six women's sports by 1986, seven by 1987 and eight by 1988, reported that the current average number of women's sports in Division I institutions is more than seven and said the exceptions proposed in the amendment would provide institutions appropriate latitude under the specified circumstances.

It was reported that the National Association of Basketball Coaches sought the delegates' support for Proposal No. 150, permitting an institution to designate three of its four permissible basketball coaches (including the part-time coach) to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.

DIVISION I-AA ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 9, 1984

The Division I-AA round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8 a.m., Monday, January 9, in the Obelisk Room of the Loews Anatole Hotel. Francis W. Bonner of Furman University presided. Panelists included the other members of the Division I Steering Committee representing Division I-AA member institutions: Jack V. Doland, McNeese State University; Andrew T. Mooradian, University of New Hampshire; Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Howard University, and Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussions. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Prior to the discussion of agenda items, Mr. Bonner noted that this was the first round table for Division I-AA. He then presented a series of general announcements concerning amendment procedures and reviewed the purposes of the round-table meeting.

Governance

Mr. Roaden summarized Proposal No. 35, submitted by the American Council on Education, indicating that the proposal would authorize the creation of a 44-member Board of Presidents, the division representation of which would parallel that of the NCAA Council. He indicated that the Board would have the power to act independently to enact any legislation it deemed appropriate, subject to review by the next Convention. In addition, any legislation passed by the Convention could be suspended until considered again by the subsequent Convention if the Board believed the legislation was detrimental to the best interests of higher education. Mr. Roaden indicated that a two-thirds vote by the subsequent Convention would be necessary to override the Board suspension, noting that an amendment to reduce the required vote to a simple majority was to be submitted.

It was noted that although the proposal initially put within the Board's purview any item concerning institutional integrity, financial viability of the institution and academics, the former category would be dropped by amendment.

Comments from the floor emphasized that the Board would be able to invoke its powers only on issues that significantly would affect academic or financial matters and that it is reasonable to expect the chief executive officers of member institutions to have significant input in matters affecting the entire institution. Others expressed concern that the Board would place in the hands of a few individuals the same power as the Convention to enact or amend legislation and would interfere with the basic democratic process of the Association.

Mr. Roaden proceeded with a review of NCAA Council Proposal No. 36, which would establish a Commission of Presidents following Council division representation with the additional requirement that at least three women, preferably one from each division, be elected to the 44-member body. Mr. Roaden reviewed the responsibilities that would be given the Commission, emphasizing that it would: (1) be able to place matters of concern on the agenda of the Council or Convention; (2) have the authority to propose legislation directly to the Convention, and (3) call special Conventions when legislation is passed by the annual Convention that it believes would be detrimental to the Association.

Mr. Roaden also reviewed Proposal No. 39, which provides that there be at least six (two from each of the three divisions) chief executive officers on the Council.

Maximum Grants

The round table turned its attention to two proposals that would modify the limit of 75 scholarships that may be awarded in the sport of football by Division I-AA institutions. It was noted that if Proposal No. 62 were adopted (raising the limit to 80), Proposal No. 63 (lowering the limit to 70) would be moot. Concern was expressed that decreasing the number of scholarships would widen the gap between Divisions I-A and I-AA.

Recruiting

Mr. Mooradian and Ms. Norrell-Thomas reviewed for the round table the proposals related to recruiting. Included were amendments that would make the contact and evaluation periods applicable to women's basketball programs as of August 1, 1984, and establish a "quiet period" surrounding the Division I Women's Basketball Championship. Also reviewed were a quiet period in conjunction with the AFCA convention, a proposal to permit a Division I-AA member institution to provide an on-campus meal to prospects visiting the campus at their own expense and one to delete the month of May from the football evaluation period.

Division I Voting

Mr. Roaden introduced Proposal No. 37 and pointed out that it was motivated by concerns similar to those that prompted the Council to sponsor 1983 Convention Proposal No. 71, which was defeated. He noted that Proposal No. 37 would permit all current Division I members to remain in the division. Under Proposal No. 37, Division I would be separated into two groups—Division I-A and Division I-AA plus I-Other—for purposes of voting on divided issues, although both groups could take action together on issues of mutual concern (exempt from the divided vote would be issues related to championships set forth in Bylaws 5-6 and 5-7). He further explained that any legislation enacted by either of the two voting groups could be rescinded by the entire Division I membership or the full membership in Convention assembled.

Mr. Roaden also reviewed Proposal No. 38, which would provide for a Division I-A legislative meeting in June at which Division I-A members could adopt legislation applicable only to that subdivision. Such legislation could not become effective prior to the adjournment of the subsequent annual Convention.

Discussion ensued regarding Division I-A's desire for greater autonomy within the Association and the possibility that Division I-A could put into

place legislation that could be detrimental to the Division I-AA membership. Mr. Roeden indicated that these proposals would provide some autonomy for the Division I-A membership and yet would retain a single Division I championship structure. Further, the proposals would permit any institution currently meeting Division I criteria to remain in that classification of membership.

Other Proposals

Several additional proposals were identified during the round-table meeting, including Proposal Nos. 148 and 149 regarding the number of football coaches permitted and Resolution No. 92 relating to the Division I-AA Football Championship format. Also explained were Proposal No. 146, which would extend the preseason practice orientation period in Division I-AA to four days, and Proposal Nos. 89 and 90, which would permit a Division I conference under certain circumstances to add a new member without jeopardizing its automatic-qualification status.

DIVISION I-OTHER ROUND TABLE

January 9, 1984

The Division I-Other round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8 a.m., Monday, January 9, in the Khymer Pavilion room at the Loews Anatole Hotel. Thomas J. Frericks of the University of Dayton and member of the NCAA Council presided. Panelists for the session included other Division I members of the Council: Eve Atkinson, Hofstra University; Mikki Flowers, Old Dominion University, and John W. Kaiser, St. John's University (New York).

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Members of Division I-Other were advised that the restructured Council considered it important for the three different groupings of institutions within Division I to have time set aside for each of them to discuss their views on Convention issues. Mr. Frericks reported there are 89 institution and 18 allied conference votes in this division. He said this was the first-ever meeting of Division I institutions that do not sponsor football in Division I but have a high degree of commonality in how their intercollegiate programs are presented.

Mr. Frericks said the panel had decided to review the proposed legislation that appeared to have the greatest impact on Division I-Other programs, since time limitations would not permit a review of all proposed amendments.

Prior to the discussion of agenda items, Mr. Frericks presented a series of general announcements concerning Convention publications and amendment procedures.

Consent Package - Bylaws and Other Legislation

Concern was expressed with Proposal No. 15, which would reduce the membership of the Public Relations and Promotion Committee from 15 to eight and delete a representative from Division I-Other on the committee. Objections also were raised to Proposal No. 17, which would specify that the sports committee secretary-rules editors who are permitted to be reelected without restriction be nonvoting members of those committees and that one member be added to each such committee where necessary to maintain the specified division representation ratio.

Academic Requirements

Proposal Nos. 24, 25 and 26 deal with satisfactory progress and were identified as key amendments that should be reviewed.

Governance

Mr. Frericks introduced Bill Baughn of the University of Colorado and a

member of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee on Governance Review, who led the discussion on Proposal No. 35, supported by the American Council on Education, and Proposal No. 36, sponsored by the NCAA Council.

Mr. Baughn stated that relative to the question of the authority and responsibility of the chief executive officers for running athletics programs, there was no difference between Nos. 35 and 36; the only difference was in the method. Proposal No. 35 would establish a board of presidents with the authority to enact new amendments to the constitution, new bylaws or new interpretations. It could suspend action of the Convention until the next Convention, plus take other initiatives that are specified. The board would have authority over academic matters and financial stability, with considerable differences of opinion as to how wide that range of authority would be. The 44 members on the board of presidents would be structured identically to the NCAA Council; that is, with each subgroup in the organization having specific representation. Division I-Other would have four chief executive officers on the commission.

Mr. Baughn said that the basic difference between the two proposals is that No. 36 uses the commission as a formal way of providing presidential involvement on a continuing basis but leaves action to the floor of the Convention. Proposal No. 35 provides for a group of presidents that can act if they think it is appropriate to do so, and then the Convention may overturn that action at the next meeting if it wishes to do so. This could create a confrontation, but the sponsors of No. 35 have indicated that it is not their intent to act on things ahead of the Convention except in exceptional circumstances; that is, they would exercise good judgment and act only where they thought such action was warranted. The essence of the proposals is a simple question of how member institutions best can be represented—by having the vote on action retained by each institution in the Convention or by a group of presidents that can take action.

Ms. Flowers explained that the intent of Proposal No. 37 is to permit legislative autonomy for Division I-A and for the rest of Division I in the divided bylaws, except for the championships revisions of Bylaws 5-6 and 5-7; to establish a Division I rescission procedure, and to clarify that legislation applicable only to a single division or subdivision can be submitted only by members of that division or subdivision. She pointed out that adoption of this proposal would expand the federated approach so that divisions would have greater opportunity for self-determination. The advantages to this proposal in many people's minds is that it prevents a Division IV. Others believe Division IV already has been created.

With regard to No. 38, Ms. Flowers said that the intent is to establish an annual legislative meeting of Division I-A members during the month of June. The Division I-A legislative meeting could adopt legislation dealing exclusively with that subdivision and could propose legislation for consideration by the annual Convention on other matters, but legislation adopted at that meeting would not become effective until adjournment of the subsequent annual Convention and would be subject to the Association's rescission procedures. The proposal also would establish deadlines for submission and circulation of proposed legislation for consideration at the Division I-A legislative meeting.

It was suggested that if No. 37 is enacted, there would be even more polarization than currently exists because if legislation is adopted in the

summer and it takes the rescission process to override in January, an interest group will be upset.

In separate straw votes, it appeared that the group unanimously favored defeat of Proposals No. 37 and 38.

Financial Aid

Ms. Atkinson explained that the intent of No. 49 is to remove the definition of commonly accepted educational expenses from the constitution and place it in the bylaws. Concerning No. 50, Ms. Atkinson stated that the adoption of the proposal would permit a student-athlete who receives a Pell grant, as well as institutionally administered financial assistance, to receive a maximum combined total amount that does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900.

Eligibility

Mr. Kaiser explained that Proposal No. 70 would permit student-athletes in sports that have two separate seasons to participate during the traditional NCAA championship playing season in their sport without being adversely affected by any participation during the "off-season."

Championships

There was discussion relative to Proposal No. 86, which would specify that a member of Division I or Division II that is initially classified in Division III in football after September 1, 1983, shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship, and Proposal No. 87, which would specify that a member of Division I that is classified initially in Division III in football after September 1, 1983, shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship and that a member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years.

Mr. Kaiser reported that Proposal No. 91, a resolution that would increase the size of the Division I men's basketball tournament field to 64 teams for the 1985 tournament had been withdrawn because the NCAA Executive Committee at its January 8, 1984, meeting had approved a recommendation of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee to expand to 64 effective in 1985.

Recruiting

Ms. Flowers explained that No. 97 is sponsored by the Collegiate Commissioners Association and would prohibit all in-person recruiting contacts in all sports during the period surrounding the first date the prospective student-athlete is eligible to sign a National Letter of Intent and in the sport of basketball during the semifinals and finals of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship. Ms. Flowers also reviewed Proposal No. 99, basketball recruiting periods, and No. 100, recruiting contact and evaluation periods in basketball.

Membership and Classification

Ms. Flowers said that No. 109 would establish the sponsorship of eight varsity intercollegiate sports for women as a criterion for membership in Division I and would authorize the Council to grant exceptions under the circumstances specified in the proposal. She indicated many institutions believe this proposal would show genuine support for women's athletics, but others submit that establishing numbers has not necessarily worked in men's

sports in terms of commitment and it is difficult to legislate institutional philosophy.

Playing and Practice Seasons

Mr. Kaiser explained that No. 123 would establish limitations on the dates for the first and last contests and the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in all sports and would authorize the NCAA Council to approve foreign tours in all sports. He pointed out that a number of amendments had been submitted to modify the specifications in No. 123.

Mr. Kaiser identified No. 132 as a significant piece of legislation in that it would delay the start of practice and competition in Division I basketball by approximately one month. It was suggested that the sponsors of the proposal did not anticipate a positive reaction, but wanted to get the membership's attention in preparation for further discussion and consideration at a later date. It was suggested that the proposal has far-reaching ramifications and requires additional study.

Personnel Limitations

Ms. Atkinson explained that Proposal No. 150 would permit a Division I institution to designate three coaches in the sport of basketball who would be the only coaches permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off-campus. She noted this proposal is supported strongly by the National Association of Basketball Coaches. She said that No. 152 would permit volunteer coaches in the sports of football and basketball to receive specified expenses directly related to their coaching duties.

DIVISION II ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 9, 1984

The Division II round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8 a.m., Monday, January 9, in the Wedgewood Room of the Loews Anatole Hotel. Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Division II Steering Committee chair, presided. Panelists included other members of the Division II Steering Committee: Joan Boand, Grand Valley State College; Judith M. Brame, California State University, Northridge; Howard Elwell, Gannon University; Asa M. Green, Livingston University; Billy M. Miller, Southwest Texas State University; Bob Moorman, Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Milton J. Piepul, American International College; James R. Spalding, Bellarmine College; Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University, and P. LaVerne Sweat, Hampton Institute.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments or other agenda items is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Mr. Lawrence introduced the panel and made general announcements regarding the round-table procedures and the annual Convention. He noted that the round table constituted the opening of the Convention for members of Division II. Members of the panel then presented the topical groupings of amendments before the Convention, emphasizing those involving Division II members.

Academic Requirements

Ms. Brame reviewed various proposals related to academic standards. Included in this review was a presentation regarding Proposal No. 25, which would specify that a student must be in good academic standing as defined by the certifying institution in order to meet the requirements of the NCAA satisfactory-progress rule. It was noted that this proposal also would require Division I and Division II member institutions to certify annually to the NCAA Academic Testing and Requirements Committee compliance with the satisfactory-progress rule and would authorize spot checks by authorized representatives of the NCAA to verify compliance.

Concerns related to the application of Proposal No. 25 were discussed. It was noted that the phrase "not on academic probation" was used in the proposal to define "good academic standing" for a student-athlete. Ms. Brame reported that the term "academic probation" was applied in different ways by member institutions; and, as a result, the adoption of this portion of the proposal could lead to inconsistent application of the satisfactory-progress rule.

Governance

The Division II delegates in attendance discussed at length the provisions of Proposal Nos. 35 and 36, each of which would establish a board of presidents within the Association. Mr. Green presented the background of each proposal and reported three basic areas of difference. These related to the structure and composition of the boards, the selection process for individuals serving and the authority that would be granted.

It was noted that a board of presidents established by Proposal No. 35 would have the authority to amend bylaws, interpretations, resolutions or constitutional provisions; and those amendments would become effective unless the next NCAA Convention voted to override the board's action. In addition, the board of presidents under Proposal No. 35 could suspend any bylaw, resolution, constitutional provision or interpretation; and that action again would become effective unless the next NCAA Convention voted to override the board's action. Mr. Green suggested that through Proposal No. 36, the NCAA Council had attempted to develop a full opportunity for the expression of presidential concerns, while at the same time maintaining the principle that legislation should be developed only after full and open debate and after an opportunity is provided for all those institutions affected by proposals to participate in the discussion and the decision.

A spokesman favoring the adoption of Proposal No. 35 suggested that this alternative would provide a more viable means of maintaining appropriate academic standards for student-athletes and achieving financial stability for member institutions. He suggested that this position was supported by an overwhelming majority of chief executive officers. A proponent of Proposal No. 36 disagreed with that position, noting that he served as a chief executive officer of a Division II member institution (as did the spokesman for Proposal No. 35) and that in fact there was a significant difference of opinion among college presidents regarding the most effective manner in which to enhance presidential involvement in the governance of intercollegiate athletics. It was suggested that a straw vote be conducted, and Proposal No. 35 was defeated by a vote of 21-67; Proposal No. 36 was supported, 71-7.

Waiver

Mr. Lawrence introduced a representative of Quincy College and noted that the institution was requesting a waiver of the Division II membership criteria under the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(f). A description of the basis for the institution's request had been forwarded to Division II institutions, and the college had indicated that adjustments had been made to meet the Division II six-sport requirement and basketball scheduling requirement during the 1984-85 academic year.

Concern was expressed by a delegate regarding the number of membership waiver requests that had been granted in past Division II round tables. The delegates initially voted (35-41) to deny the college's petition. The decision later was reconsidered, and the delegates voted (54-29) to grant the request.

Financial Aid

Mr. Sponberg presented various proposals related to the Association's financial aid provisions, including an amendment (Proposal No. 50) that would permit a student-athlete who receives a Pell Grant as well as institutionally administered financial assistance to receive a maximum combined total amount that does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room

and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900. In a straw vote regarding Proposal No. 50, those in attendance favored the amendment, 45-44.

Eligibility

The delegates discussed the application of Proposal Nos. 66 and 67 regarding outside competition during the season of the individual's intercollegiate sport. It was suggested that the sponsors of those proposals develop additional information to clarify the intended application in each instance. In a straw vote on Proposal No. 73, which would permit a waiver of the transfer residence requirement for a transferring nonrecruited student-athlete who may have participated to a limited degree in preseason tryouts in a sport, the delegates supported the amendment, 51-43.

Playing and Practice Seasons

The delegates participated in an extensive discussion of Proposal No. 123, which would establish limitations on the date for the first and last contest and the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in all sports and would authorize NCAA Council approval of foreign tours in all sports. Mr. Elwell presented background information related to the development of this proposal, and it was agreed that although certain adjustments might be made in the proposal in reference to sports such as baseball, volleyball and field hockey, the basic principle expressed through Proposal No. 123 should be supported. In a straw vote on Proposal No. 123, overwhelming support was expressed for the general purposes of the proposed amendment.

Other Topics

The delegates voted to support a revision of the Division II philosophy involving certain editorial changes and placing additional emphasis on the importance of conducting an intercollegiate athletic program based on sound educational principles.

Council Election

The round-table delegates elected the new Division II members of the NCAA Council. Mr. Lawrence explained the nominating and voting procedures, and Herman L. Sledzik of Indiana University of Pennsylvania, a Division II member of the Nominating Committee, explained the procedures used by that committee.

DIVISION III ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 9, 1984

The Division III round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8 a.m. Monday, January 9, in the Stemmons Room of the Loews Anatole Hotel. Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa), Division III Steering Committee chair, presided. Panelists included other members of the Division III Steering Committee: Anthony Diekema, Calvin College, Thomas M. Kinder, Bridgewater College (Virginia); Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College; Mary Jean Mulvaney, University of Chicago; Edwin D. Muto, State University of New York, Buffalo; Donald M. Russell, Wesleyan University; Robert T. Shields, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison; Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego; Patricia A. Thompson, Elmira College, and Elmer W. Yoest, Otterbein College. Robert F. Riedel, State University College, Geneseo, Division III representative on the NCAA Executive Committee, also served as a panelist.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Mr. Weller introduced the panel and made general announcements, including the deadline for submitting amendments to amendments. He reviewed the background of Division III, pointing out the brief history and changes that had taken place in the structure of the steering committees and the NCAA Council during 1983. He outlined the areas of discussion during the past year noting the following: liberalization of the transfer rule; sport-by-sport classification, particularly in reference to those Division I institutions playing Division III football; limitations on sports seasons; geographical waivers; role of the sports committees in NCAA championships; compliance forms, and signing of Division III athletes.

Mr. Riedel reviewed the responsibilities of the Executive Committee in financial matters and the handling of championship issues, outlining several policies. He reminded the delegates of the dues increase that will become effective in December 1984, noting that Division III dues will be \$700. Future increases in dues will be directly related to the benefits that all members receive, such as publications and communications from the national office.

Mr. Shields reviewed Proposal No. 9, noting it was a part of the consent package. He also reviewed Proposal No. 23, stating that its passage was critical. The proposal would eliminate the counting of institutions of only one sex in minimum sponsorship percentages set forth in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a) and 1-1-(b) for championships of the other sex.

Mr. Muto indicated that Proposal No. 48 would broaden Division III representation on the Football Television Committee. Since 1973, only six

Division III individuals have been eligible for the assignment.

Mr. Russell introduced Proposal No. 49, which would remove the definition of financial aid from the constitution and place it in the bylaws where it can be more easily amended. The change would allow each division to act separately on the issue.

William A. Marshall, Franklin and Marshall College, discussed Proposal No. 68, noting that the ECAC Eligibility Committee had recommended the legislation due to concerns regarding a student-athlete's eligibility between semesters. He noted that at present there is a difference between a freshman who enters at the start of the first semester or the start of the second semester. It was indicated that transfer students entering between semesters for their first enrollment would be eligible to participate immediately following the end of the fall semester; however, under current legislation, returning students who have not been enrolled in the fall semester would not be able to participate until the first day of classes for the spring semester. After discussion, it was determined that further clarification of the legislation was necessary.

Mrs. Kruczek reviewed Proposal No. 74, noting that students who transfer to Division III institutions from Division I or Division II would be eligible immediately upon receipt of a written release. She indicated that the time of securing the release would be clarified. It was noted that Proposal No. 69 would modify the transfer rule for all divisions; however, No. 74 was relevant strictly to Division III institutions. Mrs. Kruczek indicated that the Division II Steering Committee had recommended that the reference to Division II be removed. After considerable discussion regarding timing of the release and concern for implications of the proposal, a straw vote indicated that representatives were in favor of the legislation.

Gail Davis, Rhode Island College, requested that a straw vote be taken on whether the representatives supported removing the written permission by the athletics director on Proposal No. 74. The vote indicated that there was a preference to remove the permission. It was noted that the proposal as written would become effective August 1, 1984, but delegates indicated an interest in having the legislation effective immediately.

Ms. Mulvaney presented information regarding Proposal No. 84. She stated that the steering committee had recommended that it be withdrawn pending further study; reservations had been expressed by the Executive Committee regarding the quality of Division III indoor track programs and the cost of conducting the championships. John C. Martin, Fisk University, spoke on behalf of the Division III track and field subcommittee and indicated that the track coaches association had voted unanimously to initiate an indoor track championship. The Track and Field Committees had endorsed also the development of the championships since the Division III athletes do not have the opportunity to participate in the present National Collegiate Indoor Track Championships due to present standards. After considerable discussion, a straw vote indicated that delegates favored retaining the proposal.

Mr. Russell presented Proposal No. 85, noting that it would provide for the establishment of a Division III Men's Ice Hockey Championship. He indicated that the sponsorship level warranted offering the championship.

Mr. Yoest reviewed Proposals No. 86b and 87, noting that these proposals required approval by all divisions. Proposal No. 86 was identical to one proposed in 1983 that had passed in Divisions I and III but failed in Division

II. The proposal does not allow further movement into the Division III Football Championship by Divisions I and II institutions. Proposal No. 87 would provide that those Division I institutions classifying football in Division III as of September 1983 would remain eligible for the championship. A Division II institution that classified its football program in Division III would be eligible for the championship until it had been so classified for a two-year period. Mr. Yoest pointed out that the Division II Steering Committee may not support No. 86 but has indicated support for No. 87. A straw vote determined that the delegates wanted both proposals to be retained.

Monday Afternoon, January 9, 1984

Mr. Weller opened the continuation of the Division III round table by clarifying proposals discussed during the morning session. He stated that he had been requested to clarify that the Division III Men's Ice Hockey Championship had sufficient sponsorship. Representatives indicated by straw vote that they favored the championship. He further clarified that Proposal No. 49, which would allow Division III to continue to provide financial aid on the existing basis.

Nicholas Rodis, Brandeis University, presented information regarding Proposal No. 161. He discussed U.S. participation in the World University Games, stating his belief that the NCAA should become a part of the organization to provide a unified effort in collegiate sports throughout the country.

Mr. Weller reviewed Proposal No. 98, indicating that its passage would allow an active high school coach to also coach at the college level; representatives favored the proposal. In the review of Proposal No. 105, it was indicated that the amendment initiated from a concern about complimentary tickets to out-of-state individuals for an Oklahoma/Texas contest played in Dallas. By a show of paddles, the delegates indicated support for the proposal. The different points of view were noted on Proposal No. 112, which would establish, in addition to class rank, test scores and high school grades as a basis for qualifying a student for an academic scholarship.

Mrs. Kruczek reviewed Proposal No. 123 regarding length of playing season and number of sport contests. She outlined the rationale used by the Special Committee on Legislative Review noting missed class time, sensitivity to individual sport competition and a decision that the best way to restrict the season was to restrict the total number of contests played. Mrs. Kruczek noted those sports that would be counted according to dates of competition and the ones that would be covered by the total number of contests. After discussion, a straw vote indicated that the majority were in favor of the steering committee continuing to review the material for future action.

Mr. Weller reviewed Proposal Nos. 1-24, 141, 142, and 32, noting that passage of 141 would allow a student-athlete to compete on the subvarsity and varsity team without violating the contest limits established; a straw vote indicated that the majority were opposed to the proposal. Proposal No. 143 would provide the opening basketball contest to be on the Friday associated with Thanksgiving every year (taking into account calendar changes); delegates favored the change. No comments were made on Proposal Nos. 1-24 and Proposal No. 32.

Mr. Diekema presented Proposal Nos. 35 and 36, indicating that both proposals were controversial. He indicated that each would provide for

increased involvement by chief executive officers in NCAA affairs. He expressed concern that the proposals dealt with issues generally in divisions other than Division III; however, he noted that the votes of Division III delegates possibly could determine their outcome. He outlined the similarities and the differences in the proposals, noting that in Proposal No. 35 the power would be located with a few individuals whereas in No. 36, the one institution-one vote principle is maintained.

David E. Sweet, Rhode Island College, pointed out that Proposal No. 35 had limited power since it would allow suspension of a Convention issue only until the next Convention; he indicated that he supported the presidential responsibility that would be allowed by passage of No. 35.

Ken Weller, Central College (Iowa), stepped down from the chair to express an opinion on the proposals. He indicated No. 36 was based upon a collaborative and respectful relationship between various groups of people; he viewed No. 35 as attempting to accomplish the objectives in an adversarial way. He also pointed out that the operation of the NCAA had been successful in dealing with problems that have come to its attention, noting issues confronting the Association in 1983. He indicated that involvement of CEOs in the affairs of the NCAA was needed and that No. 36 would allow for that involvement by a cooperative system.

Mary Jean Mulvaney reviewed the nominations of the Division III members to the Council and the vice-president of the division. She presented the nominations for the representatives explaining the geographical areas represented. Mr. Weller then opened the meeting to nominations from the floor. No nominations were made from the floor. It was then moved, seconded and voted that Russell J. Poel be elected to the Council. The recommendation for the Division III vice-president was presented. It was moved, seconded and voted that Mrs. Kruczek take the position of vice-president for Division III.

78th ANNUAL CONVENTION OPENING GENERAL SESSION

Monday Morning, January 9, 1984

The 78th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by NCAA President John L. Toner, University of Connecticut, in the Chantilly East Ballroom of the Loews Anatole Hotel in Dallas.

1. OPENING REMARKS

President Toner: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Loews Anatole and to the 1984 Convention of this Association. As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, and one such procedure is the need to adopt a Convention Program prior to the beginning of our business session. I will now ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed with the work of the Convention.

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): I move the adoption of the printed program of this Convention.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Toner: Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own tradition and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures and several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your program. Those also appear in the Official Notice of the Convention mailed to you seven weeks ago.

In addition, you will find in Appendix D of your program a reference listing all of the Association's legislation dealing with our Convention. All of the NCAA's Convention procedures are designed to assure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any question of propriety and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time today to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure this fairness. I will remind the delegates, however, that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout.

We will, for example, be aware of the number of times an individual speaks on a given issue and the length of time taken by any one speaker, both matters controlled by Robert's.

Also, Robert's states that any motion to table that is designed to prevent debate or to kill a motion is dilatory and thus will be ruled out of order. Only a two-thirds majority of this body can suppress debate on a circularized proposal.

Once again, the Council and the Executive Committee have scheduled the adjournment of the Convention for noon Wednesday. That is designed to eliminate the quorum problem that occurred in some of the other Conventions several years ago. We trust that the early adjournment will enable all delegates to remain in attendance throughout the business session.

There are certain other procedures we employ in attempting to use our time efficiently. The chair will attempt to eyeball as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of a particular issue.

If the delegates intend to debate an issue, we ask that they be at one of the microphones and be prepared to speak on the motion that has been made and seconded. If the chair sees no one at the microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible. Please note that the microphones will be numbered. We will try to use those numbers in recognizing speakers.

On bylaws issues, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The results of the division vote will not be announced until all the divisions have voted.

In the division round tables this morning, your attention was called to errors or corrections in your Convention program. I will not repeat those at this time.

Each year in this session, we review the voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions. Each member institution may have four accredited delegates, one voting and three alternates. Delegates may exchange voting privileges among themselves because all have been approved as voters by the chief executive officer of the member institution. Active members also may have visiting delegates if they desire, but those visitors may not participate in the Convention in terms of speaking or voting. Allied conferences that have voting privileges in accordance with the constitution have the same voting and speaking rights as the active members. An allied conference that does not have a vote, and any affiliated organization, may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote. We ask that these individuals identify themselves and their affiliation clearly when they rise to speak. In fact, to assist the recorder of these proceedings, we ask all to identify themselves and their affiliations. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers. I would remind you that any delegate wishing to withdraw a proposal should notify the NCAA staff in advance of the business session.

Please be reminded that the business session will begin promptly at 8 a.m. tomorrow. We will begin with the two consent packages in the program. Consent packages are designed to include only noncontroversial or house-keeping proposals and will be voted on as packages of amendments unless a delegate requests that a particular proposal be removed for separate vote.

It is now my privilege to identify for you the several Convention Committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee is chaired by Charles H. Samson of Texas A&M University. The Men's Committee on Committees by Kenneth G. Germann, commissioner of the Southern Conference. The Women's Committee on Committees by Judith M. Sweet of the University of California, San Diego. The Voting Committee is chaired by Edward L. Hanson, of Montana State University. The Committee on Memorial Resolutions is chaired by Mary Ellen Cloninger of the University of Wyoming. And the Committee on Credentials is chaired by Judith Hirsch, of California State University, Hayward.

These committees, as appointed appropriately by the Council and the Executive Committee, are listed in your program.

Now, in accordance with our procedures, the reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented orally but are included in the printed Annual Reports, a copy of which you received when you registered. The report of the secretary-treasurer and that of the Executive Committee also appear in the Annual Reports. At the beginning of the business session tomorrow morning, we will entertain motions to receive all of those reports. This gives delegates time to review those items in the Annual Reports before you are asked to approve them.

We do have one report to present to you orally this morning. That is on the matter of the NCAA Football Television Plan.

2. REPORT OF THE FOOTBALL TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Hugh D. Hindman (Ohio State University): For the past two years, the NCAA's Football Television Committee has administered the 1982-1985 NCAA Television Plan under a judicial cloud. Although these proceedings have created uncertainties for the committee on number of occasions, our committee has tried to deal with this task in a positive and optimistic manner and has administered the plan fairly and evenhandedly for all member institutions.

As most of you know, the U.S. Supreme Court will determine during the 1984 term if the Association can administer television rights on behalf of its members. Although a trial date has not been set, legal counsel believes that the case will be heard sometime in February and a decision may be announced in June.

Many of you will recall that Divisions I-A and I-AA overwhelmingly approved a mail referendum last July that authorized the Division I Steering Committee to call a special meeting for these divisions any time to discuss television issues after the beginning of this Convention. Had the Supreme Court rejected the Association's request for a writ of certiorari, the Division I Steering Committee would have convened the meeting this past fall. Since the court agreed to hear the case, there was no urgency in arranging a special meeting. Once the Supreme Court does hear the case, however, there may well be a need for such a special meeting.

The Football Television Committee is submitting a resolution which is being sponsored by the NCAA Council. You are asking this Convention to extend the deadline for a special meeting to review television issues until the court has reviewed the current litigation. The meeting will permit all Divisions I-A and I-AA members to address these important issues in an open and straightforward forum that is available to each institution.

The committee urges your support of the resolution. Related to that resolution, and to the committee's commitment to administer football television in an equitable manner and to address concerns that have been raised by the membership in recent months, the committee is considering amendments to the 1982-1985 NCAA Football Television Plan that it believes would be in the best interest of the Association.

The committee is developing principles to govern a Saturday night package for Division I-A and Thursday night programming for Division I-AA that would provide each institution or conference the authority to produce its own television series at night. This program would be limited to the NCAA district in which the institution or conference is located. It would eliminate the more formally structured supplementary series that has been a part of the plan the past two years.

At the conclusion of this Convention, the committee will meet with Division I-A conferences and I-A institutional representatives to determine if the membership has a genuine interest in an open-origination concept for night television and cablecasting. Should this meeting provide a consensus in favor of alterations in the current plan, the committee then will meet with the networks to negotiate nonmonetary items in the plan and contracts requiring attention and then submit the final alterations to the Division I Steering Committee for its endorsement before polling the Divisions I-A and I-AA membership.

Many conferences, and some institutions, currently are exploring television alternatives for 1984 and beyond. The Football Television Committee is confident that the resolution and these changes in the 1982-1985 NCAA Football Television Plan will permit these entities to continue planning. Should any one of you have further questions or suggestions that the committee should consider as it reviews these possibilities, I encourage you to contact me or any other member of the Football Television Committee during the next three days.

On behalf of the committee and the carrying networks, I also want to thank you for the support and cooperation you have provided us during the past year. Let us hope we can continue to work together in a unified spirit in the years ahead.

President Toner: Thank you, Hugh. At this point in the agenda, we move to the report of the NCAA Council. To present that report is the current Division III Vice-President, Kenneth J. Weller, president of Central College.

3. REPORT OF COUNCIL

Kenneth Weller (Central College (Iowa)): Mr. President and members of the Association, eight years ago I made a calculated decision to become involved in the activities of the NCAA—particularly with the newly conceived Division III. I did so for the same reasons that currently have given rise to Proposal Nos. 35 and 36—the feeling that chief executive officers should share in corporate efforts to integrate the academic and athletic interests of higher education. Since then, I have served for seven years on the Long-Range Planning Committee, for seven years on the Division III Steering Committee and for the last four years on the Council. The experience has been enjoyable, productive and enlightening.

The years have given me a truly unique opportunity as a president to view the structure and the people of the NCAA. From that rare perspective, my appraisal is in sharp conflict with the implications in some recent discussions that impugned the wisdom and the breadth of viewpoint of the Council. I believe such implications, whether intended or not, are unfair and inaccurate. The popular press often implies culpability by the NCAA for problems in the area of athletics. But an examination of the historical record shows clearly that the NCAA's role has not been to cause problems but rather to provide solutions for athletic abuses.

Today's much-publicized perversions of educational goals and academic integrity have not arisen from a reluctance of the NCAA to consider appropriate new legislation but from particular institutions that have violated the letter and the spirit of existing regulations. The problems are caused by tantalizing financial payoffs that are available to major programs and the difficulty some institutions encounter in controlling their own programs in the face of relentless outside pressures. It is a matter of

athletics versus academics within institutions, not within the Council.

Among the members of the current Council, there is, in my judgment, a high level of concern for national and institutional interests rather than a narrow, provincial athletic outlook. The people of the Council during my experience have worked diligently and effectively representing their institutions and divisions with integrity. As a counterpoint to my assignment as the Council spokesman reporting to the membership, I would like to speak for the membership to the Council expressing admiration and appreciation for the quality and the quantity of their work.

Now, then, the report of the 1983 Council to the 78th annual NCAA Convention. Under the provisions of the constitution, the Council is charged with establishing and directing the general policy of the Association between Conventions and reporting its actions to the annual Convention.

The official report of the Council is found in the minutes of the Council meetings as they appear in the published Annual Reports of the Association. These minutes summarize the Council's discussions and actions of the entire past year.

In addition, The NCAA News has reported the primary decisions of the Council after each meeting. This year, the News expanded its coverage of Council meetings by presenting listings of every action taken by the Council, a practice that will continue in the year ahead. My oral report is intended to supplement the abridged minutes and the reports in the News. Therefore, I will emphasize only a few specific topics.

The first topic is involvement of chief executive officers. During the past six months, much attention has been given to ways and means of increasing and enhancing the involvement of institutional chief executives in the activities and in the deliberations of this Association. A number of different groups have been involved, including the Select Committee on Athletic Problems and Concerns in Higher Education, the American Council on Education's Committee on Division I Intercollegiate Athletics, the NCAA Special Committee on Governance Review and, of course, the NCAA Council itself.

The pros and cons of Proposal Nos. 35, 36 and 39 have been widely publicized, and I will not attempt to review them in this report. I will only say on behalf of the Council that it believes that Proposal No. 36, the approach that is suggested by the Select Committee, represents a constructive and a lasting approach to the chief executive officers' involvement in athletics. It is, in the opinion of the Council, superior in numerous respects to the plan presented as Proposal No. 35 by the committee of the American Council on Education.

The Council's ongoing attempt to respect the particular interests of different groups of institutions in college athletics—and specifically the structure of Division I—were clearly shown in its work in 1983. For example, first, the Council and the Executive Committee have been expanded and restructured as approved by this Convention a year ago. This has produced a more-federated approach to the work of the Council and to the steering committees. The Council believes the new structure is working well, especially in terms of greater representation for all segments of Division I.

Second, the first Division I summer meeting was concluded and was judged a success by every group in attendance.

Third, the general round table has been eliminated from the annual Convention in favor of additional time for the separate division round

tables. Within Division I, there are separate round tables for I-A, I-AA and other Division I members, providing forums for discussion of matters particularly affecting their separate groups.

Fourth, the divisions have made significant progress in developing a consensus for statements which outline distinct objectives for integrating academic and athletic programs. Specific authorization for such activity is suggested in Proposal No. 9.

Finally, the work of the Select Committee and the Special Committee on Division I Criteria, both of which included a significant number of college presidents and chancellors, has resulted in at least three substantive proposals in terms of Division I interests at this Convention.

Proposal No. 37 will permit greater autonomy on voting issues within Division I, giving those members greater opportunity to control their own legislative destinies.

Proposal No. 38 will establish an interim summer legislative meeting for Division I-A only, as was recommended by the Select Committee.

Proposal No. 49, another Select Committee recommendation, will move the financial aid limitations from the constitution to the bylaws, where each division can amend these limits to suit its own needs.

The Council believes that these steps toward greater federation within the overall framework of the Association are essential. They are necessary in recognizing and in meeting the needs of the diverse segments of our membership. This Association has had a long and productive history of adjusting its structure to meet these needs and clearly should continue to do so.

I have mentioned the work of the Select Committee on Athletic Problems and Concerns in Higher Education. This study, completed this fall, was funded by the Association but was operated and staffed as an independent commission. John P. Schaefer, former president of the University of Arizona, served as the executive director of the Select Committee and assumed the chair when David P. Gardner, then with the University of Utah, relinquished the position as a part of his acceptance of the leadership of the University of California system.

The Council received the widely distributed report with great enthusiasm. While it was too late in the year to develop meaningful legislation in response to all of its recommendations, the Council has committed itself to a careful consideration of each of the Select Committee's findings and recommendations in the next year. We believe the Select Committee has made a truly significant contribution to intercollegiate athletics through this careful analysis of problems and a wise consideration of optional solutions.

Another development of note in 1983 was the formation of a Special Committee on Women's Interests, which includes the women serving on the Council and the Executive Committee. Only three years ago, the delegates at the 1981 Convention adopted a detailed governance plan directing this Association to provide representation, programs and services to women's athletic programs in member institutions.

The implementation of that program has been remarkably successful in a short period of time. The establishment of the Special Committee on Women's Interests, which will meet four times each year, gives women administrators in athletics an active and responsive group to which they can turn for discussion of special concerns and issues.

The Council also spent considerable time this year reviewing actions of the

Administrative Committee, various interpretations of regulations, membership actions and committee reports. These and all other Council considerations in the past year are included in the 1982-1983 NCAA Annual Reports.

Mr. President, this concludes the summary and the highlighting of the report of the 1983 NCAA Council. I recommend that the delegates review the Council minutes as printed in the Annual Reports. Tomorrow morning, we will offer a motion to the Convention to accept and approve the full report of the Council.

President Toner: Thank you. At this time I would like to introduce Mary Ellen Cloninger of the University of Wyoming to present the report of the NCAA Memorial Resolutions Committee.

4. MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mary Ellen Cloninger (University of Wyoming): The following is a list of our colleagues who have passed away during this past year:

Lew Andreas, Syracuse University
 Ike Armstrong, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 Wilbert Bach, University of Miami (Florida)
 Richard O. Baumbach, Tulane University
 Clair Bee, Long Island University
 Madison "Matty" Bell, Southern Methodist University
 Lisle Blackburn, Marquette University
 Alan J. Bovard, Michigan Technological University
 Dick Bowman, U.S. Military Academy
 William H. Britton, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Lauren Brown, Michigan State University
 Paul W. "Bear" Bryant, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 L. C. "Pete" Butler, University of Northern Colorado
 Gino "Joe" Calcagni, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
 Jesse Chavis, Virginia Union University
 Bill Cofield, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 Blanton Collier, University of Kentucky
 E. Jay Colville, Miami University (Ohio)
 T. Douglas Connelly, Villanova University
 Sherman R. "Pete" Couch, University of Utah
 Samuel Cozen, Drexel University
 Clem Crowe, University of Iowa
 Lowell "Red" Dawson, University of Pittsburgh
 Dave DeFellipo, Villanova University
 William Phillip Dickens, Indiana University, Bloomington
 Rex Dockery, Memphis State University
 Robert E. Donham, Bowdoin College
 Lloyd "Sonny" Dove, St. John's University (New York)
 Bruce Drake, University of Oklahoma
 Charles "Rip" Engle, Pennsylvania State University
 Les Etter, University of Michigan
 Michael Farrell, Weber State College
 Donn Christopher Faros, Memphis State University
 Mel J. Garland, Indiana University-Purdue University, Ft. Wayne
 Marshall "Little Sleepy" Glenn, West Virginia University
 Julius Glosson, University of Missouri, Columbia
 Frederick L. Hovde, Purdue University
 Charles H. Irwin, Grand Valley State Colleges

Carl Jorgensen, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay
 Harry Lees Kingman, University of California, Berkeley
 Bob Ledbetter, Grambling State University
 P. A. Lee, University of Florida
 Donald Liebendorfer, Stanford University
 John MacInnes, Michigan Technological University
 Leonard Marti, University of North Dakota
 John Maskas, Delaware Valley College
 Dan McClimon, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 Pete McDavid, University of New Mexico
 George L. McGaughey, Lafayette College
 Jack "Red" McGuire, Iowa State University
 Dan F. McMullen, Auburn University
 Joe McMullen, Towson State University
 John Ayers Merritt, Tennessee State University
 Douglas Mills, University of Illinois, Champaign
 Elmer Mitchell, University of Michigan
 A. B. "Bugs" Morris, Abilene Christian University
 Jess Neely, Rice University
 Jack O'Leary, University of Central Florida
 Forrest C. Page, Evansville University
 Stanford Perkins, Norfolk State University
 John Plumbley, Rice University
 Major J. Powell Jr., Morris Brown College
 Don Protexter, Morningside College
 Ray Ragelis, Northwestern University
 Ralph Romano, University of Minnesota, Duluth
 Harvey Nual "Rusty" Russell, Southern Methodist University
 Francis J. Ryan, Yale University
 Frank F. Sabasteanski, Bowdoin College
 Henry G. Shands, North Texas State University
 George Edwards "Bo" Shepard, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
 Roger Smith, Florida State University
 Samuel G. Smith, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
 Glen Swenson, University of Texas, Austin
 Joe Thomas, Indiana University, Bloomington
 Dick Turner, University of Virginia
 Dallas Ward, University of Colorado
 Art Westphall, State University of New York, Buffalo
 Donald S. White, University of Connecticut
 Gordon "Pop" White, Roanoke College
 George Wolfman, University of California, Berkeley
 Jerry D. Young, University of Alabama, Birmingham
 Russell Young, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh

[NOTE: The Memorial Resolutions Committee Report was delivered at two different times. All names are included here for ease of reference.]

At this time will you please rise with me for a moment of silence in memory of these colleagues.

[The assembly rose for a moment of silence in memory of their colleagues.]

President Toner: Thank you, Mary Ellen and members of your committee. Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes the morning session.

[The Convention recessed at 11:10 a.m.]

NCAA HONORS LUNCHEON

Monday, January 10, 1984

The 19th annual honors luncheon was held in the Grand Ballroom of the Loews Anatole Hotel, NCAA President John L. Toner, University of Connecticut, presiding.

President Toner: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 19th annual honors luncheon. Please rise for the invocation, which will be given by William Carr, director of athletics at the University of Florida.

William Carr (University of Florida): May we pray. Father, we come before you today with hearts made glad by your provision for our needs. We especially thank you for the opportunity to recognize those who have demonstrated excellence and for the encouragement and challenge we gain from them. Bless our time together, we pray in your name. Amen.

President Toner: Ladies and gentlemen, honored guests: Although we are aware that some are still completing lunch and that some new tables are now being set up—because of the fact that there is a record luncheon attendance today with more than 1,400 people—we have a full agenda and I would like to begin the program at this time. It certainly is a great privilege for me to share the dais with these outstanding Americans seated in front of you. The NCAA honors luncheon has become the highlight of the annual Convention, and the awards that will be presented here exemplify the many positive influences intercollegiate athletics have on higher education.

These we honor today not only have achieved athletic success, but their will to succeed academically and professionally certainly is indicative to each of us that the young people with whom we have had the opportunity to work not only are our nation's leaders today but will continue to be in the future.

Intercollegiate athletics, and its role in higher education, always will be subject to criticism, internally and externally. Academic and recruiting abuses, although focusing upon a minute percentage of our programs and the athletes participating in them, will continue. But our motivation for promoting and defending the role of intercollegiate athletics within higher education always will be strengthened by the overwhelming commitment by our athletes in all sports to excel academically and athletically, and by the significant positive contributions our former athletes have made in a myriad of environments.

Graduation rates for student-athletes continue to indicate that participants in our programs graduate at a higher rate than the nonparticipating students. The commitment by this Association to strengthen academic requirements for our participants surely will better prepare representatives of our programs to meet the challenges of the future.

This luncheon permits each of us who devote countless hours to ensuring that our programs maintain their proper niche within the overall goals of our respective institutions to recognize current and former student-athletes, and

their institutions, who have made significant contributions to our society and for the betterment of mankind.

Although each of our honorees today represent the highest levels of distinction, they are not unique. Each institution represented on the dais, and in the audience, can identify thousands of other current and former student-athletes who have also become role models in the environments they represent. Today our emotions will be subjected to the academic and athletic triumphs, professional accountability and leadership, and the determination to succeed, respect and love as we learn more about our honored guests.

These stories make our commitment worthwhile. They also ensure this grand tradition that permits us to recognize exemplary achievements of our current and former athletes at our annual Convention will continue to mature.

Many of us have been touched personally by those we honor today, and those we have recognized in previous years, and we are richer because we have had the privilege to know or observe their successes.

At this time, I wish to introduce a few people sharing the dais who will not be recognized later in our program. Seated to my left is the director of athletics at Northwestern State University, Tynes Hildebrand.

Next is an individual who has made many significant contributions to the Association through a variety of committee assignments and service on the NCAA Council. I, of course, have had the opportunity to work with him on a variety of difficult problems that have confronted our membership over the past year; and I continue to marvel at his perception and his ability to suggest viable solutions that reflect the sensitivities of each NCAA division. Of course, I am talking about our secretary-treasurer, John Davis, faculty athletics representative at Oregon State University.

Of course, to those who know this next gentleman and who have had the privilege of working with him, he has excellent administrative and professional ability, and is one who has upheld the highest standards of NCAA purposes, our executive director, Walter Byers.

Now, for our master of ceremonies, who has earned a quality reputation in journalism, developing countless feature essays on ordinary Americans. And he even has a house in the great state of Connecticut. (Laughter.) Many of you probably are disappointed that his familiar "RV," which has begun its second million miles touring the back roads of America for the popular CBS "On the Road" series, was not parked in front of the hotel.

After all, they do go hand in glove; and the RV has played an important role in Charles Kuralt's portrayal of Americans to Americans on the CBS Evening News, which has earned him two Emmys and two Peabody awards. Time magazine has described him as "the laureate of the common man."

Mr. Kuralt's journalistic career began at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where he served as editor of the Daily Tar Heel. Following his graduation, he was a reporter and columnist for the Charlotte News. He received his first prestigious writing award two years later.

He joined CBS in 1957 and was named a news correspondent in 1959. He was the Latin America and chief West Coast correspondent until 1964, when he returned to the network's New York headquarters. His assignments have covered numerous events that have been, and will be, recorded in American and world history textbooks.

Mr. Kuralt undoubtedly is best known for his "On the Road" series. He set out in a battered motor home in 1967 to see America and has been traveling

its highways ever since. Each week he returns to New York to host "Sunday Morning," a 90-minute program that features a mix of essays on the arts, news and sports. His "Dateline America" essays are heard weekly on the CBS radio network, and he published a book by that title in 1979. In a few weeks, he will begin coanchoring "American Parade," which will be aired in prime time.

Now, it is my privilege to present to you our master of ceremonies, Charles Kuralt.

Charles Kuralt: Thank you, John, and thank you all for letting me, kind of an outsider, come here to join in paying honor to these outstanding student-athletes of the present and of the past. They represent not themselves alone but also their colleges and universities, which are among the finest in the country. You will not leave this room today without a feeling of pride in them and what their schools gave them, and what they gave their schools and gave all the rest of us.

Spending so much time out there on the back roads, I see a lot of athletics in America. I can't pass a sandlot ball game without stopping to watch for a while. Sports brings us together on the field and in the stands. It brings rich kids and poor kids together, black and white kids together, and nowadays boys and girls together, which is a lovely thing, I think. There is a generation of boys coming along which sees nothing at all unusual about being struck out by a girl.

The best athletes take great pride in that selfless thinking, winning for the team. Those who support these teams become in their support kind of a family. The schools use athletics to bring alumni and students and friends together. The cities see sports uniting their citizens. If you think the stakes are any smaller out there on the back roads, then you have never been to a six-man high school football game over here in East Texas.

Those we salute today are the very best, but I would just like to observe that you do not have to be the very best to gain great things from athletics. I speak as one of the slower dashmen of the Central High School track team myself, once referred to by my home-town paper as Central High's flashy Charlie Kuralt, my best notice from that day to this. (Laughter.)

It is not notices that I mean. It is teamwork and unity and the setting of goals and the ability to face success and accept adversity, the things one learns in playing games. I think the best coaches never forget that these are games; and I think the best players, including those that you will meet this noon, gain from the games as they go on into life.

None of the honors that are about to be given are for excellence on the field alone. They are for excellence in general. If you will glance at your program, you will find a lot of impressive things, but one very impressive list of 90 student-athletes who have combined academic and athletic excellence to earn \$2,000 NCAA postgraduate scholarships to continue their education. This is a program that started 20 years ago now, in 1964; and in those years the NCAA has invested—I wish I could say \$2 million—\$1,990,000.

Well, we are just a few thousand short of the \$2 million. That is a lot of money in assisting 1,469 students to pursue their goals in graduate schools.

The chair of the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Committee is seated to my left. He is Fred Jacoby, the commissioner of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Instinct is a natural gift and all great football players have it; but the specialty players—the running backs and quarterbacks, receivers and

defensive backs—often are described by their coaches as individuals who possess great instinct.

Joe Delaney was one of those instinctive athletes, one of the National Football League's most outstanding running backs. He was an all-America running back and sprinter on the track team at Northwestern State University (Louisiana). He was selected in the second round of the professional draft by the Kansas City Chiefs; a year later, the Chiefs, and everybody else in the NFL, were wondering why he had not been selected as the first choice in the entire draft.

He was the NFL rookie of the year, he played in the Pro Bowl and he set Kansas City records for most yards rushing in a season and a game, most consecutive 100-yard rushing games and most 100-yard rushing games in a season. Joe Delaney's 1,121 yards rushing was the seventh-highest ever for a rookie, and he did not start until the fifth game of the season.

"Great" is an overused word in athletics, as we must all have observed, but Joe Delaney was a great runner.

During the offseason, Joe lived in his home town in Louisiana. He was there on June 29, doing two of the things he loved most—preparing for another football season and playing with his children. He had learned that a television station in nearby Monroe was sponsoring a "Kids Day" at a city park and decided to drive a carload of neighborhood children 80 miles for a day of fun.

When he got to the park with the children, Joe noticed a large, natural hole that had been filled with water. He warned them not to go near the hole. Then he began playing softball with the youngsters. Suddenly, he heard shouts from the waterhole. Three boys, who were not with his group, had wandered into the hole and had ventured too deep in the water. There were other people close to the hole, but Joe Delaney was the one with the instinct. He acknowledged to somebody who asked as he ran toward the water that he was not a good swimmer, but he kept running anyway and went into the water toward the children. One of the children fought his way back to the shallow water, and two of them did not. Neither did Joe Delaney.

Valor is the strength of the mind or spirit which enables a person to brave danger with boldness and firmness. There is no greater act of valor than the one in which a person gives his own life to save the life of somebody else.

This is the first occasion on which the NCAA has awarded this honor posthumously. Of course, the award in itself is not going to ease this great loss for his wife, Carolyn, and his three daughters; but we hope it will always serve as a reminder to them and to you that Joe Delaney's life was filled with courage and love for others. He had all the great instincts.

I now present to you Carolyn Delaney, who will accept the NCAA Award of Valor.

Carolyn Delaney: I would like to say thanks to the NCAA for presenting this award to me on behalf of my husband, Joe Delaney. Thank you.

Mr. Kuralt: The NCAA annually salutes five outstanding student-athletes from the past year and five former student-athletes who have distinguished themselves in their professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates. The responsibility of choosing these honorees rests with the Top Ten Selection Committee, whose members are listed in your program. Let me tell you, they have a tough job, as you can imagine. Many other worthy individuals were nominated. The criteria are listed in your program.

I will ask the winners to rise at their places and remain standing when I call their names and after a brief resume of their collegiate careers to accept their awards from Secretary-Treasurer Davis at the dais.

John E. Frank, Ohio State University, football. His institutional representative is Hugh D. Hindman, the director of athletics.

You may know that John Frank was one of the two best tight ends in America this fall. You may not know that his academic success really overshadows his accomplishments on the playing field.

John is committed to football, you could say. He was named to the all-Big Ten Conference team the past two years. He is the fourth leading receiver in Buckeye history and holds both school season and career records. He also was the team's captain, led the Buckeyes to one Big Ten title and four bowl appearances and participated in the Hula Bowl.

If you think John's accomplishments up there on the screen are impressive, they really are not as impressive as his accomplishments on the road toward his lifetime goal of practicing medicine. As a premed student, he earned a 3.82 grade-point average majoring in chemistry. He served as a research assistant for three years. He already has coauthored a published medical research paper.

You would think that would be enough, but John Frank is also a Big Brothers of America volunteer, participates in the Sphinx, Bucket and Dipper, and Romophus campus service organizations and has been elected to Phi Eta Sigma and Alpha Lambda Delta honor societies.

I was a member of Phi Eta Sigma. That is the freshman honor society. It all went downhill from there for me, but not for John. (Laughter.)

He also is an NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree and was selected a National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame Scholar-Athlete.

Ladies and gentlemen, John Frank of Ohio State University.

Elizabeth L. Heiden, University of Vermont. Her institutional representative is Sally Guerette, the primary woman athletics administrator.

Everyone knows Beth Heiden is a world-class athlete in speed skating. She won a bronze medal in the 1980 Winter Olympic Games. Beth won the world speed skating championship in The Hague, Holland, in 1979, and four consecutive national championships between 1977 and 1980. Last winter, she etched her name in the NCAA record book in a different sport. Beth became the first national collegiate women's cross country champion, helping the university to place second in the national championships for the third consecutive year.

She has been an all-East ski team selection for two years. She never finished lower than fourth during her cross country skiing career. She also skied on the cross country relay team, which was undefeated until it finished third in the NCAA championships. For the past two weeks, she has been participating in the U.S. Olympic skiing trials in Lake Placid.

Beth also is a world-class cyclist. She won a world championship in Sallanches, France, in 1980 and won national championships in 1977, 1979 and 1980.

She began her undergraduate career at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where she earned selection to the freshman honor society. Beth established a 3.48 grade-point average majoring in mathematics while completing her academic pursuits at Vermont.

She was selected athlete of the year in Vermont in 1983 and in Wisconsin in

1978, 1979 and 1980. She was national coach for the Special Olympics International Year of the Handicapped; and, just in passing, she was the 1982 queen of the Lake Placid Carnival.

Ladies and gentlemen, Beth Heiden, from the University of Vermont.

Terrell L. Hoage, University of Georgia, football. His institutional representative is the director of athletics and head football coach, Vincent J. Dooley.

Terry Hoage is one of the premier defensive halfbacks in this country. After all, he earned consensus all-America honors as a junior, leading the nation in pass interceptions and leading the University of Georgia to its third consecutive Southeastern Conference Championship and the national title.

This fall, Terry's personal performances earned him consensus all-Southeastern Conference honors for the third straight year. He was selected ABC's player of the game in its season-opening telecast against UCLA; and even though he missed three games late in the season after sustaining an injury, he again was selected a consensus all-America.

His 12 interceptions as a junior set a school record and equaled the Southeastern Conference record, and he holds the Georgia record for pass steals in a game with three. He is an outstanding special teams performer, having blocked a field goal or two during his career. He, too, played in the Hula Bowl and will represent the South in the Senior Bowl.

Terry also is an all-America in the classroom. The dean's list student has established a 3.71 grade-point average majoring in genetics. He, like John Frank, plans to pursue a career in medicine.

Terry participated in the NCAA preseason football promotion tour, has been selected to receive an NCAA postgraduate scholarship and was a National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame Scholar Athlete.

Ladies and gentlemen, Terry Hoage, University of Georgia.

Stefan G. Humphries, University of Michigan, football. His institutional representative is Donald B. Canham, director of athletics.

Stefan Humphries' football success at the University of Michigan can be attributed to hard work and personal sacrifices. Although he had earned a varsity letter as offensive guard as a freshman, few were willing to predict that he would earn all-America honors as a senior. But spring practice between his freshman and sophomore seasons gave the Wolverines hope that Stefan might be something special on the football field. He received the Meyer Morton Award as the player showing greatest development and promise following spring practice.

He went back to Ann Arbor in his sophomore year as a starting offensive guard and earned all-Big Ten honors as a junior and all-America recognition as a senior. He played on two Big Ten championship teams, and the Wolverines played in four bowl games during his career.

Stefan Humphries was also an academic all-America. The Wolverine cocaptain earned a 3.71 grade-point average majoring in engineering science, the same as Terry Hoage.

A National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame Scholar-Athlete and NCAA postgraduate scholarship awardee, he holds membership in Tau Beta Pi, Michiguama and Golden Key honoraries and the Ambatana social organization. He also is an active member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

Stefan Humphries also played in the Hula Bowl all-star game and leaves

immediately after this luncheon for Tokyo to play in the Japan Bowl all-star game.

Ladies and gentlemen, Stefan Humphries, University of Michigan.

J. Steven Young, Brigham Young University, football. His institutional representative is the director of athletics, Glen C. Tuckett.

I guess even if Steve Young had never been an athlete at Brigham Young he could not have been an ordinary student, because he is a direct descendant of the pioneer for whom that university is named; and, as such, the life he would lead as a collegian there would be closely monitored by everyone on and off the campus.

But the spotlight which could have had a regional focus became a national spotlight when Steve said he wanted to play quarterback for the Cougar football team. Over the past 10 years, BYU has produced three of the greatest quarterbacks in college football history, two of whom are Gifford Nielsen and Marc Wilson, who were also Top Five recipients at these luncheons in years past. Steve Young not only became part of the passing tradition established by his predecessors, he surpassed their performances.

Steve led the nation in passing and in total offense this season. The team captain established 11 NCAA records and tied three national standards during his career at Brigham Young. He twice was selected to the all-Western Athletic Conference team. He was a unanimous choice as the all-America quarterback and placed second in the voting for the Heisman Trophy this fall.

A National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame Scholar-Athlete and NCAA postgraduate scholarship winner, Steve has established a 3.40 grade point average majoring in finance and international relations.

Steve, as you would expect, devotes a great deal of time to the Church of Latter Day Saints; he also has been active in fund-raising efforts for the American Cancer Society, Utah Young Association and Muscular Dystrophy Association of Utah.

Steve played on four Western Athletic Conference championship teams. He also participated in the Hula Bowl game and will join Stefan Humphries on that flight to Tokyo following today's luncheon.

Ladies and gentlemen, Steve Young, Brigham Young University.

J. Steven Young (Brigham Young University): First, I would like to thank the NCAA not only for the awards but also for the guidance that it has given myself and all other collegiate athletes throughout their careers and for the blessings we all enjoy as collegiate athletes. I was just saying the other day, as a lot of new things are happening to me, that I was so disappointed that I could not call the NCAA for the things they were not allowing me to do any more. I am on my own now, so I am really in trouble.

This is the greatest award that each of us has ever received, because it encompasses all the things in life that make us whole person—sports, academics, leadership, citizenship, and service to our community.

There was a time in my freshman year at Brigham Young University where I was the eighth-string quarterback. Being the eighth-string quarterback is somewhat like being in the school choir but singing in another room. You are not really part of anything that is happening. If you had asked me at that time if I could envision myself here today speaking to this group, I would have said there is no way.

I believe the basic qualities to get here were within myself and the other

four honorees many years ago. We just did not know what they would lead to. The qualities that lead to recognition such as this are perseverance, positive attitude, the desire to be challenged and faith in our own abilities as well as faith in God. We have, in the short time we have been alive, lived not only to reach other expectations but more importantly reached to fulfill our own expectations of ourselves.

This is what life is all about—to fulfill our dreams so that we know that we cannot search out the easiest path but the one which will make us better people and in the long run, inturn uplift those around us. This award signifies challenge but also gives inspiration to work that much harder to meet the challenges of tomorrow. These challenges will be to continue to find the proper mixture of athletics, education, service to others and service to our God, so that we might leave the places where we have been better for others to follow.

There is a poem that illustrates the sort of mind that I have grown up with for many years. It is very simple but I find it very appropriate:

"Stick to the task until it sticks to you.

Begin as you are and work longer.

Power and praise goes to the one who stays.

Stick to the task until it sticks to you.

Bend at, sweat at, smile at it, too,

For out of the bend and sweat and smile

Will come life's victories after awhile."

Nothing worthwhile comes easy, and I believe this award represents the hard work and dedication to the task that each of us has given through his whole life. We obviously could not have achieved what we have without teaching, counsel, support and love from many people. Each of us must point to different people along the way to thank for their support. I point to my parents as a stabilizing and central element in my life. Their love and encouragement and examples have always led me in the right direction. Even when others booed me, my parents always cheered. I share this award with them, and I hope that all five of us might continue to lead our lives in such a way that it might make us eligible for such an award far in the future. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kuralt: Congratulations again to you and to each of the other current honorees. Now, we salute the silver anniversary honorees.

Maj. Gen. Robert D. Beckel, United States Air Force Academy, basketball and baseball. His institutional representative is Col. John J. Clune, director of athletics.

Maj. Gen. Beckel's successful career in the United States Air Force is no surprise to those individuals who began preparing him for it 25 years ago at the United States Air Force Academy. He served two years as the cadet wing commander, distinguishing himself as the top military cadet in the entire academy; he was a squadron honor representative for four years, and he was chair of the Protestant Council.

Today, he is director of operations at the United States Air Force Headquarters in Washington, D.C. An outstanding basketball and baseball player at the academy, the former all-America still holds academy records with 55 points against Arizona in 1959, a 22.8 points-per-game career scoring average, and season standards of 26.4 points per game and 555 total points. He was captain of the basketball team three seasons and the baseball team

for two years.

He was honored as the top graduate in pilot training and was assigned to a fighter squadron before serving two years with the U.S. Aerial Demonstration Squadron, the Thunderbirds. He has logged over 3,500 flying hours, including one year of combat in Southeast Asia. He became commander of the 410th Bombardment Wing and then the 7th Air Division of the Strategic Air Command at Ramstein Air Base in Germany, where he was the senior representative in Europe. Maj. Gen. Beckel returned to the academy as the commandant of cadets before receiving his current assignment at Air Force headquarters.

His military decorations include the Silver Star, the Bronze Star medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross with four Oak Leaf Clusters, the Air Medal with 15 Oak Leaf Clusters and the Meritorious Service Medal with 15 Oak Leaf Clusters.

He has been active in civic and charitable activities and has been a United Fund area chair and telethon volunteer. He has served on school boards and city councils and has been active in the Special Olympics.

Ladies and gentlemen, Maj. Gen. Robert D. Beckel, United States Air Force Academy.

Peter M. Dawkins, United States Military Academy, football and men's ice hockey. His institutional representative is Carl F. Ullrich, director of athletics.

The United States Military Academy, as we all know, has given us national leaders for a long time, 181 years. Generals Lee, Grant and Eisenhower are just a few; but one of the younger graduates established a standard by which all cadets are measured today. Pete Dawkins' career has been exemplary in all areas. Consider, if you will, that as an undergraduate he received the coveted Heisman trophy, which annually is awarded to the nation's most outstanding football players. He also was the first captain of the Corps of Cadets, the highest honor a West Point student can receive.

He was commandant of the 2,400-member corps and ranked seventh in a class of 501 cadets. He was the first cadet to simultaneously hold titles of first captain, class president and football team captain. The Rhodes scholar led Army in six statistical categories and became the youngest inductee in the National Football Foundation College Football Hall of Fame at age 36.

He had never played ice hockey competitively before he entered the academy, yet he earned three varsity letters as a defenseman and led the East in scoring and earned all-East honors as a senior.

He earned two degrees at Oxford University; and, in another sport he had never played, Pete became one of England's top Rugby players.

His military career began as a combat infantryman. He holds senior parachutist, ranger and air assault qualifications. He became rifle company commander in the 82nd Airborne Division, became senior advisor to the Vietnamese First Airborne Battalion, was assigned to the Pentagon in the office of the Army chief of staff, commanded the First Battalion's 23rd Infantry in Korea and became the military assistant to the deputy secretary of defense.

He assumed the Ford Ord headquarters command in 1976, became assistant division commander of the Seventh Infantry Division and assumed command of the third brigade of the 101st Airborne Division in 1979. Upon completion of that assignment, he was named deputy director of strategy,

plans and policy in the office of the deputy chief of staff for operations and plans, and served in that capacity until he recently retired as brigadier general from the United States Army to join Lehman Brothers, Kuhn, Loeb, Incorporated in New York City.

He has received numerous military commendations, including the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with V Device with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with two Gold Palms and one Gold Star.

He serves on numerous boards, including the Council on Foreign Relations, the University of Kentucky School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, the Princeton University Robertson Foundation, the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports and the Women's Sports Foundation.

Ladies and gentlemen, Pete Dawkins, United States Military Academy. *Stephen Friedman, Cornell University, wrestling.* His institutional representative is Laing E. Kennedy, director of athletics.

Goldman, Sachs & Company is a major international investment banking and securities firm that provides a broad range of financing, advisory and brokerage services for a diverse clientele. For the past 10 years, it quietly has been establishing itself on Wall Street as the primary advisor in merger and acquisition transactions.

For nine consecutive years, the firm has had record earnings and total revenues; and receipts from mergers and transactions account for more than one-third of its estimated \$250 million annual earnings. It is no secret, however, on Wall Street, or throughout financial institutions domestically and internationally, that the individual responsible for Goldman, Sachs' merger and acquisition strategy is Steve Friedman, who joined the company in 1966 and today is one of its youngest partners.

Goldman, Sachs recognized Steve's abilities early. He was named vice-president after only four years with the firm and was named to the 11-person management committee that governs the private partnership three years later. He primarily has been responsible for the mergers and acquisitions department and the private financing department but was promoted in November to cohead of investment banking operations. He directs the firm's business of raising money for and providing financial advice to major corporations, real estate developers and governmental businesses worldwide.

A former Eastern Intercollegiate 157-pound wrestling champion, the Cornell captain led the last Ivy League team to win an EIC championship in that sport. Steve was the United States' 160-pound amateur champion and placed first in the Maccabiah Games in 1961. He was selected to participate in the World Wrestling Championships for this country but did not compete because the competition conflicted with his Columbia Law School examinations.

He was a member of the Quill & Dagger honorary society and the President's Committee on Student Conduct, Cornell's highest disciplinary body. Steve graduated 10th in a law school class of about 250 and practiced law for two years before joining Goldman, Sachs.

Active in professional and civic activities, he is a trustee of Institutional Property Assets, a director of Witco Chemical Corporation, is past chairman of the Wall Street Division-United Jewish Appeal Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, a director of the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council and actively supports and participates in the Georgetown Center for

Strategic and International Studies, a leading foreign policy and strategic "think tank" based in Washington, D.C.

Ladies and gentlemen, Stephen Friedman, Cornell University.

Allen L. Geiberger, University of Southern California, golf. His institutional representative is Richard H. Perry, director of athletics.

Al Geiberger is one of pro golf's most outstanding players. Of course, he has won more than \$1 million, which ranks him in the top 20 all-time money winners. His professional victories include the prestigious PGA championship, the Tournament Players Association and the Western Open. He also is the first professional golfer to break 60 in a PGA tour event. Al had a mediocre 59. If you want to know what you need for a 59, what you need is 11 birdies, one eagle and 23 putts in a 30-29 round. That was enough to wrap up the 1977 Danny Thomas Memphis Classic.

Al earned unlimited qualifying exemption status in 1966 and has represented the United States on two Ryder Cup teams. Yet few individuals in any profession have overcome the physical adversities that Al Geiberger has had to overcome.

From 1969 to 1973, Al suffered from severe intestinal problems and dropped out of the top 60 money winners. He came back with a victory in the Sahara Invitational in 1974. He again had serious physical problems and underwent surgery in 1978 and came back with a win in the Colonial Invitational the following year. He then sustained a knee injury requiring surgery and then had emergency surgery to remove his colon a few months later.

This was a permanent ileostomy, a surgical removal of the large intestine and connection of the remaining intestine to an external opening just below the waistline.

To the thousands of people who have been through this—and I went through this on a temporary basis for about a year—and to Al's colleagues on the tour, he has been an inspiration demonstrating by example that an individual can overcome physical adversity and go on with life and career as if it never happened.

Al is cochair of the National Foundation for Ileitis and Colitis Sports Council, an organization that is devoted to making the public more aware of digestive diseases. He devotes numerous hours counseling victims of ileitis before they undergo ostomy surgery, emphasizing that others who have had similar surgery lead productive lives and that ostomy surgery can be a new beginning.

Al also devotes his talents and his financial contributions to other charitable causes, including Children's Memorial Hospital, the Crippled Children's Association, the Heart Association, United Ostomy Association, and the University of Southern California.

A two-time all-America golfer at USC, he played on teams that set an CAA dual-match victory record with 51 consecutive wins. He twice was the Southern California Intercollegiate Tournament medalist.

Ladies and gentlemen, Al Geiberger, the University of Southern California.

Peter Ueberroth, San Jose State University, water polo and swimming. His institutional representative is Gail Fullerton, president of San Jose State University.

While most Americans anxiously await the start of the summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles, Peter Ueberroth probably wishes this competition

had been completed last August. For the past four years, the president of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee has been planning what many media representatives say will be remembered as the model for the successful administration of these games.

An outstanding water polo forward at San Jose State University, Peter was selected as an alternate for the United States Olympic team following his sophomore season. He then led the Spartans in scoring and was the team's top point producer the next two seasons. He was the team captain, cosports editor of the yearbook and held membership in Delta Upsilon fraternity.

Peter began his career as the office manager of the Independent Airlines Association. One year later, he was named vice-president of Los Angeles Air Service, which was renamed Trans International Airlines in 1961; he founded Transportation Consultants International in 1963. He then purchased 85 percent of the stock in Ask Mr. Foster Travel Service and Colony Hotels.

In 1974, he founded First Travel Corporation, a holding company for the transportation, travel and hotel corporations. He served as president and chief executive officer for the next six years, and it became the second largest travel company in North America in 1979 behind American Express with gross revenues exceeding \$300 million and more than 200 offices worldwide. He sold First Travel when he was selected president of the organizing committee in 1980.

Although Peter is committed first to administering a celebration for the participants, he also has initiated business concepts that will be beneficial to amateur and intercollegiate athletics in the Los Angeles area.

Should the games produce a projected \$50 million profit from its \$500 million budget, 40 percent of those funds will be distributed to amateur athletics in southern California. Another 40 percent is earmarked for amateur sports throughout the United States, and 20 percent will be channeled to national governing bodies of amateur sports. No taxpayer money or government funds will be used to finance the Olympics.

Peter negotiated a \$225 million television rights fee from ABC Sports. Nice going, Peter. (Laughter.) He expects to receive \$360 million in worldwide television rights by the start of the games.

Peter also developed a concept encouraging corporate sponsors to erect facilities for the 1984 games and then donate them to universities and colleges in the area. A swimming and diving stadium recently was constructed at the University of Southern California, and a velodrome was built on the Cal State Dominguez Hills campus.

Peter long has been involved in the activities of his community. He has served on the L.A. Visitors and Convention Bureau board, the USC School of Business Administration board and the Big Sisters of Los Angeles board. He is a Boys Club of America trustee and a member of the Statue of Liberty Foundation and San Jose State University Spartan Foundation. He was twice selected man of the year. He also served on the U.S. Department of Commerce's Travel Advisory Board and as chair of the Travel Industry Association of America.

Ladies and gentlemen, Peter Ueberroth, San Jose State University. Responding on behalf of the silver anniversary honorees is Pete Dawkins.

Peter M. Dawkins: Thank you very much, Charles. All this talk of silver anniversaries reminds me of a comment that Casey Stengel once said. "I have

absolutely no experience with this and it is all bad." (Laughter.) Do you notice how old films slow down and the new ones they run real fast? It must be something that happens as the films age. (Laughter.)

I am particularly pleased to have this chance to make just a few remarks on behalf of the five silver foxes and to be here with you today, because there are many, many dear friends of mine among you. I had the good fortune of serving for 10 years on the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Committee, so I feel like in a way I have come back home to the family.

You know, when I was listening to Charles talk about the exploits of Today's Top Five, I thought that if you ever worried about where intercollegiate athletes in this country are headed, there is an awful lot of reassurance in those five and in the five times five who we all know out there who are doing good things in that realm of intercollegiate sports today.

In trying to think about what it might be appropriate to comment on in just a moment or two at this occasion, it occurred to me if you reflect back in history, there is not a single society that has ever claimed to be a civilized society that has not had sports as a part of it. There is something in the human condition that makes us want to have competitive athletics be a part of our lives. I think that the way that we have in this society integrated it as part of the collegiate experience, the way young people prepare to lead their lives, makes sports have an even more special stature.

In trying to figure out what that all means, it occurs to me that there is a lot of talk nowadays about this being a time of transition. Some people are even saying we are moving from one epoch now into a new epoch. They talk about moving from the industrial age to the age of information. One of the important things about that transition, it seems to me, is that it invokes stress. It invokes strain on us as a society. You see that in crime rates, in divorce rates and in the dependency on drugs and alcohol. When you reflect upon it, I think it is true to say that one of the things that makes this country different from most others is that we operate on the basis of a so-called "compact". We operate on the basis that you obey laws voluntarily, not because there is a cop on every corner.

I once heard it said that true discipline is doing what you should do in the absence of authority. It seems to me that the one thing above all that is gained for us through competitive athletics is that sense of discipline. We call it sportsmanship. It is the notion that winning really amounts to achieving something according to the rules, not in the event that you cheat on the umpire. That is something that can be learned not just by people who play sports but by the many, many more who are spectators and who are imbued with the spirit that is projected by sports.

So for the five of us, I would simply say that we are not important to ourselves to any significant extent at all, but we are very important as symbols, symbols of the fact that sports can not only be fun, which they are, and a joyous part of our lives, but competitive athletics, and particularly intercollegiate athletics, are a positive and strong and important part of our lives, and not just while we are competing, but afterwards.

One of the ways that they contribute is by strengthening that social compact, that sense of doing things because of what ought to be done. Obeying rules voluntarily may indeed be the way that we as a nation can endure the stress and the strain of this transition we are going through, and we will continue to have a very special place here on the face of the earth for generations to come.

So for all of us, we want to thank the NCAA and you, most of all. We want to thank the experience of competitive athletics for what it has contributed to us all. Thanks again.

Mr. Kuralt: Now, it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of program, the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

In your program are pictures of past winners of this award. The award recognizes a distinguished citizen of national reputation and outstanding accomplishment, who, having earned a varsity athletic award in college, has by a continuing interest and concern for physical fitness and competitive sport and by personal example exemplified most clearly and forcefully the ideals and purposes to which college athletic programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated.

As you will notice in your program, there are former Presidents in this list, a Supreme Court justice, a United States ambassador, military leaders, pioneers in space and medicine, corporate leaders and entertainers. All truly have been worthy of this recognition.

Today's honoree is a special man, whose credentials neatly place him in the same category with previous leaders of military service who have received the Theodore Roosevelt Award—former President Eisenhower, Gen. Omar Bradley, Adm. Tom Hamilton—and whose names have been etched in the pages of history for their contributions to world peace.

But probably none of these, nor many of the others who have accepted the responsibility to preserve this nation's freedom has endured the personal physical and mental anguish that confronted Vice Adm. William P. Lawrence during his distinguished career in the United States Navy.

His interest in the military and aviation, and his awareness of the quality academic and athletic opportunities available at a service academy, perked at an early age. He read a history of the first 50 years of Vanderbilt football, authored by Top Ten Selection Committee member Fred Russell, which featured a chapter on a star halfback who had died in World War I. He closely followed the role model established by a boyhood idol, Vandy all-America center Carl Hinkle, who became the First Captain of the Corps of Cadets at West Point.

Dreams became a reality for the Nashville native when he received an appointment to the United States Naval Academy, where he established an exemplary record participating in three varsity sports—basketball, baseball and football—and graduated eighth in a class of 725. He was elected president of the class of 1951, served as brigadier commander of the academy, and developed the brigade honor concept that is prevalent at the academy today.

He earned his aviator wings in 1952 and soon was deployed to an aircraft carrier in the Western Pacific. He attended the Naval Aviation Safety School and the U.S. Naval Test Pilot School, where he was designated the honor graduate, and served as a test pilot in the flight test division and as an instructor in the test pilot school.

He was then assigned as the flag lieutenant to commander, Carrier Division Six, aboard the USS Saratoga, deploying to the Mediterranean and North Atlantic. His next assignments included assistant operations officer of Fighter Squadron 101, tour navigator of the gun cruiser USS Newport News, maintenance officer of Fighter Squadron 14 aboard the attack aircraft carrier USS Franklin D. Roosevelt and senior aide and executive assistant to

the commander-in-chief of the U.S. Strike Command.

He then made two cruises to Vietnam aboard the multipurpose aircraft carriers USS Ranger and USS Constellation. During his first tour of duty, he was the executive officer of Fighter Squadron 143 and then served as commanding officer of the squadron when he returned to Vietnam in 1967.

On June 28, 1967, just two months after his second tour of duty began, Adm. Lawrence led his squadron on a mission to the Hanoi-Haiphong area, but inclement weather diverted the squad of phantom jets to Nam Dinh. Upon reaching the target, an area where materials were transferred from ships to trains, his plane was hit by enemy fire. Instead of turning back, he continued to lead the assault on the target. His plane became unflyable and he ordered his rear-seat aviator to parachute as it dove to 3,000 feet.

Vice Adm. Lawrence then jumped at 2,000 feet and landed in a rice paddy up to his waist in water. He was captured and transferred to the Hanoi Hilton prisoner-of-war complex. He was tortured during interrogation and placed in a tiny cell. He was the senior officer in his section of the prison; and although placed in solitary confinement he believed it was his primary responsibility to maintain communications, which was not permitted by the guards, to retain military efficiency and to permit the prisoners to provide support for each other.

He helped devise a system utilizing various sound codes that permitted him to accomplish these goals. On one occasion, in an effort to break his spirit, Vice Adm. Lawrence was isolated in a six-foot-square dark cell with a tin roof. During the day, the temperature was estimated to be at least 120 degrees. He developed heat rash and sores that prevented him from moving. He began concentrating on poetry. He composed a poem during those days, "O Tennessee, My Tennessee." It is today the state poem.

During his six years of confinement, he was kept in isolation for five years, 10 1/2 months. He was released on the third of March, 1973. Following his convalescence from this almost unimaginable experience, he was designated a distinguished graduate of the National War College, earned a master's degree in international affairs and served as commander of a light attack wing of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, director of the Aviation Programs Division and assistant deputy chief of naval operation for air warfare before receiving an appointment as superintendent of the Naval Academy.

He then was promoted to vice admiral, assumed command of the United States 3rd Fleet for two years and became deputy chief of naval operation for manpower, personnel and training and chief of naval personnel. He is responsible for formulating and overseeing the execution of Navy policies on all personnel issues.

He received three Silver Stars for gallantry. He received the Bronze Star for "establishing and maintaining an intraprison camp communication system, despite threat or torture and brutal treatment." He received two Navy Commendation medals, one for signals and improvised techniques to maintain communications within the prison camp. He received the Distinguished Service medal as the senior ranking officer of Camp Vegas, prisoner of war camp by resisting all attempts by the North Vietnamese to use him in causes detrimental to the United States. He provided superb leadership and guidance to his fellow prisoners of war during extended periods of severe pressures. He set a pattern of resistance for all to follow.

A recipient of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame's gold medal, Vice Adm. Lawrence also has been awarded the Distinguished Flying

Cross for extraordinary courage, three air medals, the Navy Commendation medal, and a Purple Heart for his heroic efforts as a prisoner of war.

I take great pride, and we all should, in meeting now the recipient of the highest honor the NCAA can give, the Theodore Roosevelt Award, Vice Adm. William P. Lawrence of the United States Naval Academy.

President Toner: Vice Adm. Lawrence, in recognizing your superb career as a student and as an athlete and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, I am pleased to present to you the 1984 Theodore Roosevelt Award in recognition of your distinguished naval career and your service and personal sacrifice in advancing the cause of freedom. Congratulations.

Vice Adm. Lawrence: Thank you very much. It is truly a great honor for me to receive this coveted award from an organization which I greatly respect and which contributes so much to the fiber and strength of our great nation. But I must admit that I am somewhat humbled to receive this special consideration from the NCAA, for I feel I have gained much already as a college athlete, a father of a college athlete and an avid spectator and a school administrator.

Now, I must add that I certainly was not a star in the sense of the other ladies and gentlemen who we have honored today. I guess my greatest distinction as a college athlete is the fact that the number I wore as a Naval Academy football player has been retired from service. That is because Roger Staubach wore that number. (Laughter.)

You all never knew who provided that inspiration to Roger. (Laughter.) Seriously, I am really pleased for the recognition that this award provides to the importance of athletics at our nation's service academies. We feel that participation in competitive sports and a dedication to physical fitness are vital to the development of our future military leaders.

I think Gen. Douglas MacArthur expressed this quite eloquently in his now famous statement, "On the fields of friendly strife are strewn seeds which on other fields on other days will bear the fruits of victory." At our nation's service academies today, we compete in close to 30 NCAA sports for both women and men and an equal number of club and intramural sports. I would like to publicly recognize and commend those superb athletic directors, Otto Graham, Bo Coppedge, Carl Ullrich and John Clune, for the guidance and input they have provided to our cadets and midshipmen.

I would like to recognize my former basketball coach at the Naval Academy, who was a great inspiration to me as a young midshipman. After an outstanding career of coaching at Navy, he went on to become a distinguished athletic director at William and Mary, Ben Carnevale.

I also am particularly honored to receive an award bearing the name of Theodore Roosevelt. His life certainly epitomized all that the NCAA stands for and strives to do. As many of you know, as a young child he was sickly and asthmatic; through great effort and perseverance he developed himself into a fine physical specimen and became an ardent sports participant. At the same time, he was a superb intellectual who fully understood the value of a fine academic education.

We, in the Navy, feel a special closeness to Teddy Roosevelt because as the assistant secretary of the Navy and later as president, he perceived the importance of a strong navy to national power and influence. He certainly must be considered the father of our present-day Navy, which is defending the interests of our country around the world. It was through his efforts and

influence that the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis was rebuilt in the early part of this century to become the fine institution which we have there today.

One Navy vessel has already borne his name, and a nuclear aircraft carrier now under construction probably will be called the U.S.S. Theodore Roosevelt. I have long felt that there is a close interdependence between the psychological and physiological elements of human endeavor. I have found that this can be a true synergism between physical and mental fitness.

This has been proved true to me many times during my career. I saw this very dramatically during combat and the POW experience. Nothing helped me endure the ordeals of my captivity more than a fine academic education and my experience on the athletic field. Those qualities developed on the athletic field and in the classroom—courage, knowledge, discipline, resourcefulness, a spirit of teamwork, the will to win are the very same attributes of American national character that have made our country so great. I commend each of you here for your commitment to the student-athlete ideal. You cannot be dedicating your life to a more noble purpose. I am very proud to be your colleague. Thank you very much.

President Toner: Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to present to Rear Adm. C. R. Larson, superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, an institutional award commemorating this occasion.

Mr. Kuralt: Well, just one more word from me and the word is thanks. I am proud to have been here on a day like this and to salute people like these. Just one word from CBS. It is also thanks. We are proud of our long association with the NCAA as broadcasters of your games on radio and television, and if you have any interest in seeing how the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championships turn out through 1987, and all of us who went to the University of North Carolina are dying to know (laughter), I know you will know where to look and listen.

I congratulate each of these people who have been honored just one more time, especially the five young ones. I would love to be sitting out there 25 years from now to see them sitting over here where Pete Dawkins and Al Geiberger and all the rest were seated today. It has been a great pleasure for me to be with you. Thank you.

President Toner: Thank you, Charles. It is now my pleasure to pay respect to you by way of an NCAA crystal set that we wish you would take with you on your road to further travels.

It certainly has been a great luncheon, and again I congratulate each of the honorees on behalf of the entire membership.

Now, if you will please rise, Bill Carr will give our benediction.

Mr. Carr: May we pray. Lord, we must acknowledge that all good things come from you. Your gift of life to us makes all things possible and gives meaning to all we do. We thank you for this truth. Amen.

DIVISION I ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 9, 1984

The Division I round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 2:46 p.m. Monday, January 9, in the Stemmons Auditorium of the Loews Anatole Hotel. Gwendolyn Norrell of Michigan State University, Division I vice-president, presided. Panelists included the chairs of the Divisions I-A, I-AA and other Division I round tables conducted earlier that day: Francis W. Bonner, Furman University, Division I-AA; Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton; other Division I members; and John R. Davis, Oregon State University, Division I-A.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Council Election

The Division I delegates proceeded to elect Division I representatives to vacancies on the NCAA Council. Ms. Norrell referenced the nominating and electing procedures as printed in the Convention publications. Charles H. Samson, Texas A&M University, chair of the Nominating Committee, presented each candidate for a Division I vacancy, also as printed in the Convention publications. Each candidate recommended by the committee was elected without opposition.

Statement of Philosophy

Secretary-Treasurer Davis, chair of the Special Committee on Division I Criteria, presented a proposed statement of philosophy for Division I members, as developed by the special committee and published in a pre-Convention issue of The NCAA News. He noted that Divisions II and III had published statements of philosophy that had been in effect for several years, and the special committee believed it advantageous for Division I also to adopt a statement defining membership in the division.

Copies of the statement had been distributed to the delegates attending the round table, and Mr. Davis read and commented upon the various points therein. He then moved its adoption.

Two speakers spoke against adoption of the statement, one stating that it appeared to be closer to a statement of Division I-A philosophy and that Item Nos. 5 and 6 in the statement should be studied further. The other questioned the necessity for the statement and its references to programs that are national in scope and that serve the general public. A substitute motion to refer to committee was approved by the delegates.

Waiver

Ms. Norrell introduced Dennis Keihn, California State University, Los Angeles, to present that institution's request for a waiver of the Division I

classification criteria. All delegates had received a summary of the request in advance of the Convention. The institution sought to classify its men's soccer program in Division I and requested a waiver of the 2,000 rule for one year in that sport only. After Mr. Keihn left the session, the delegates rejected the request for a waiver.

Academics

Amendments to several proposals in this section were explained, including the clarification that Proposal Nos. 27 and 28 were intended to specify that a transfer from a two-year institution would be required to meet the same satisfactory-progress requirements upon enrollment in a Division I member institution that the transfer would have had to meet had he or she been enrolled in the member institution during the freshman and sophomore years.

Governance

Presidents and chancellors of several member institutions spoke in behalf of Proposal No. 35, which would create a Board of Presidents with substantial authorities; several amendments to that proposal also were explained. The speakers stated that the key distinction between No. 35 and No. 36 (to establish an NCAA Presidents' Commission) rested in the authorities that would be vested in the respective bodies, emphasizing their belief that the authorities specified in No. 35 were necessary for the presidential group to have the desired impact. They argued that the Board of Presidents would deal only with academic issues and financial matters of the greatest importance.

Presidents speaking in opposition to No. 35 urged the delegates to retain the Convention as the decision-making body of the Association, with each member institution maintaining its right to a final vote on any issue affecting it. They also suggested that the authorities of the proposed Presidents' Commission actually would touch more areas of athletics governance than those in No. 35 and would result in a meaningful, influential presidential involvement.

Another speaker questioned the nomination procedure attendant to No. 36, suggesting instead the procedure incorporated in No. 35. Still another questioned both proposals, suggesting that neither treated the basic need facing the Association, which was described as a smaller, more efficient forum than the Convention for legislative procedures.

Jack V. Doland, McNeese State University and a member of the Special Committee on Division I criteria, then explained Proposal No. 37, which would permit greater voting autonomy within Division I. He emphasized that the special committee had considered numerous approaches to the Division I membership problem, settling on No. 37 as a compromise that would grant Division I-A members and all others in the division the right to adopt certain of their own rules (subject to rescission) while not removing any institution from Division I membership.

Other Legislation

The delegates then reviewed sequentially the rest of the legislative proposals facing the Convention. While several proposals were explained in more detail, no substantive discussion ensued.

BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday Morning, January 10, 1984

The business session of the 78th NCAA Convention was called to order in the Chantilly Ballroom by NCAA President John L. Toner.

5. ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

[Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and general committees, treasurer, Council and Executive Committee.]

6. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules

P. LaVerne Sweat (Hampton Institute): On behalf of the Council, I move approval of Proposal Nos. 1 through 4, which compose the consent package of constitutional and other amendments.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal Nos. 1 through 4 are considered to be noncontroversial and are housekeeping in nature. Therefore, they would be voted on as a package. However, if there is any objection to any item being considered as a part of this package, that item may be removed for a separate vote.

[Proposal Nos. 1 through 4 (pages A-1-5) were approved.]

Consent Package—Bylaws and Other Legislation

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal Nos. 5 through 23, with the exception of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): I would like to request that Proposal No. 12 be taken out of the consent package.

President Toner: All right.

[Proposal Nos. 5 through 11 (pages A-5-9), 13 through 16 (pages A-10-12) and 18 through 23 (pages A-14-17) were approved.]

Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): My reason for requesting that it be taken out is to allow some discussion. As a member of that committee, I do not remember discussing its composition. Perhaps someone else does remember.

I do believe that when it states the committee will be constituted as athletic director, one man and one woman, and no assistant or associate athletic

directors, this virtually disenfranchises women from serving on that portion of the committee. As a result, I would urge that we defeat this. Our committee meets in two weeks and we can bring it back next year.

[Proposal No. 12 (page A-9) was defeated.]

Sports Committees—Secretary-Rules Editors

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Andrew T. Mooradian (University of New Hampshire): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 17-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to delete the words "football rules and men's basketball rules" from the proposed amendment basically because those two rules committees do not run the championships. There are separate committees formed to run the championships. The secretaries of both committees have been valuable members from their experience, and I think they still deserve a vote on those two committees.

[Proposal No. 17-1 (page A-14) was approved by all divisions.]

Robert F. Busbey (Cleveland State University): I am concerned about this particular piece of housekeeping legislation. Most housekeeping legislation is just that. I think this has potential for creating problems we do not need with the membership on the sports committees.

The rules editor on any sports committee is a vital part of that committee. He or she must be somebody quite familiar with the rules—their construction, their background, their intent—and, most importantly, be able to communicate with coaches and administrators in the field who throughout the year contact that rules editor for interpretations.

My concern is this: I do not think that we are going to be able to attract over a long period of time, in fact, perhaps in the immediate future, the type of people we need on the rules committee if we don't even allow them to vote. It is a single vote on a committee of, in many cases, a dozen members; but it does provide a continuity and it is important that the rules editor be the type of person who is involved and who is given the opportunity to vote in the meetings.

It appears to be an innocuous little piece of housekeeping, but I submit that it could have quite extensive results that we just, I think, do not need. I strongly recommend that we defeat this particular piece of housekeeping.

Eve Atkinson (Hofstra University): The position of the secretary-rules editor is one of heavy responsibility. It is especially one of heavy responsibility for the secretary-rules editors who have the dual responsibility of formulating the official playing rules and assisting in developing policies and procedures governing the administration conduct of NCAA championships as stipulated in Bylaw 12 and Constitution 7.

To feel threatened by the "assumed" power, the secretary-rules editors who currently have one vote out of 13 on the sports committees of baseball, men's soccer, men's swimming, men's track and field, and wrestling, less than 7.6 percent of the committee's votes, is absurd. These sports do not have the power, magnitude or scope of the sports of football and basketball.

This proposal costs the NCAA membership more money by increasing the size of the committee by one. These secretary-rules editors in these proposals

can only be reelected if recommended for reelection by the chair of the committee, then forwarded to the Men's Committee on Committees and then finally approved by the membership at the annual Convention.

Continuity is strongly needed in rules interpretations and in editing NCAA rules books in the sports affected by this proposal. The time commitment of these secretary-rules editors in attendance in sports committee meetings is great, along with rules interpretations. Their expertise and voice in their sports must not be wasted. I strongly urge the membership to defeat Proposal No. 17.

Mr. Sponberg: In deference to the two previous speakers, the intent is merely to maintain consistency with geographic and division representation on all of our committees. That is the sole intent. The single-vote issue obviously is of concern to some people; but since those terms of office are without restriction, the intent and the desire is to remove that voting privilege.

[Proposal No. 17 (pages A-12-14) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 17-1. (141-110 in Division I, 95-33 in Division II, 92-72 in Division III).]

Satisfactory Progress

Jack R. Wentworth (Indiana University, Bloomington): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

There basically are three elements as a student-athlete moves toward graduation. One is hours, another is courses and the third is grades. This Convention has taken care of the first two. We have a required number of hours per semester and a required number of hours for satisfactory progress.

We also have now courses that apply toward a specific degree. This kind of completes the circle. It is a simple mathematical fact that the further you go along in your academic progress, the more difficult it is to raise your grade-point average. Therefore, this resolution would move that student-athlete toward his or her degree.

James H. Wharton (Louisiana State University): The problem I have with this proposal is that we are setting absolute criteria that would apply to all universities. In the next proposal to be considered, No. 25, we specify that the student must be in good standing, namely, not on academic probation.

It seems to me important to give the faculties of the various institutions the prerogative to set the requirements for what academic probation means. It just so happens that the criteria in Proposal No. 24 would be very close to the limitation for academic probation in our institution. That would not be true of all the institutions within the membership. Therefore, I think we should reject this particular proposal and use the good academic standing in Proposal No. 25 to accomplish this result.

Paul W. Gikas (University of Michigan): I object to Proposal No. 25 before No. 24, because in No. 25 the definition of good standing varies from school to school. It also varies within schools within an institution. The school that has a higher grade-point average required for good standing status could be put at a competitive disadvantage, whereas Proposal No. 24 precisely sets a grade-point average and gradually increases it during the adjustment period of the first two years of the school. So, I urge support of No. 24 and I am opposed to No. 25.

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): I would urge a "no" vote on No. 24 and a "yes" vote on No. 25. While it is true that different institutions have different numerical criteria for probationary students, it also is true that different institutions have different median grade-point averages for all students. Surely, the objective here is to require that the athletes establish an academic position relative to their peers in that particular institution.

If a given school has for all students an average grade of, let's say, 3.000, surely that institution is in quite a different posture from one that has a typical grade-point average of, let's say, 2.000. Unless there is a great deal of documentation of uniformity of average grades among our 900 institutions, Proposal No. 24 simply doesn't make any sense.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): I want to disagree with my friend Jack Wentworth. I have seen a number of fourth-year students come through with a 1.99 average and make it without any question. I think the absolutes that are prescribed by this provision simply are not practical.

John Moore (Old Dominion University): There is much important business before this Convention; but the issue of the academic integrity of our athletic programs, in my judgment, is the most significant. Last year, this Convention took action to rectify some of the problems which faced the NCAA through the passage of Proposal No. 48. We had much debate over that proposition.

It is important to complete the task that was before us last year. We have that opportunity by passing Proposal No. 24. These are minimal standards. They do not in any substantial way encroach upon the autonomy of our individual institutions. This is a collective program. Failure to address it by passing No. 24 this year will indicate further to those who question our motives and our values that we are not able to support reasonable academic standards for our athletes.

[Proposal No. 24 (page A-17) was defeated by Division I (107-189) and Division II.]

Satisfactory Progress

Chapin Clark (University of Oregon): I move adoption of Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

I ask for a division between Parts A and B.

President Toner: If there is no objection, we will allow the division.

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): I move adoption of Proposal No. 25-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The primary reason for the amendment is to eliminate from the original proposal "i.e., not on academic probation," because there is no standardized or reasonably comparable academic probation measure in our respective institutions.

There are two things involved here. When we were able to be in "loco parentis" to our students, of course, we could tell them what they would do while they were in school. I recall at the University of Washington at one time, where we had major extracurricular activities, if the person was on probation you had to withdraw. The student body president had to quit being student body president. That, of course, caused a reasonable amount of furor on the campus. Now, you would not even think of saying that a

person who is still in school would be limited in any respect to what his extracurricular activities would be. Our rules generally try to put the student-athlete essentially in the same position as all students.

If any student on the campus can participate in any extracurricular activity, I do not know why we cannot say the student-athlete should not be able to participate in that extracurricular activity.

The other thing, and perhaps more importantly, is that academic probation has such various meanings. We can get a situation where, for instance, a person who has a very high grade-point average but may be taking something less than the full academic load is automatically on probation, even though the following term he will be taking an extra load so that he will automatically be off probation and at all times has a grade-point average perfectly satisfactory in progress toward graduation.

There is not anything that says that in each institution academic probation means the same thing. Those who have high academic probation standards would find themselves in the almost intolerable situation of competing with an institution that has low academic standards. The competitive position would be seriously hurt.

It seems to me this is an undesirable imposition on the local autonomy, and I urge the Convention to adopt Proposal No. 25-1.

Edward T. Foote (University of Miami (Florida)): I would like to speak to the main motion and against the amendments. This motion, to many of us who have considered it, is one of the most important that will come before this Convention. It is designed to stem from the fundamental proposition which I know everybody in this room believes, that we are dealing with students who first are athletes.

We say it and this puts teeth in it. In recent Conventions, there has been an effort to clarify what we mean by students; because if we do not know what we mean by students, the rest of it doesn't flow very well. This is an effort to round out the definition of a student.

Basically, Part A of No. 25 sets out 10 categories of tests for a student. The first six are old—satisfactory completion of an accumulation of total semester or quarter hours in a designated program, etc. This is already the law of the Convention and of the NCAA. The next four are new.

The first is that the progress be toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies. That is to avoid the possibility that a student can be taking 12 hours by skating all over the curriculum, assuming that any of us has easy courses, taking the easy ones and not those prescribed by the faculty leading toward a degree.

Then, that the courses taken by a full-time student as defined above would be completed in good academic standing. Now, I understand the points that were made; but our thinking was as follows: we have many different grading systems among the institutions represented in this room. Some of us have a 4.000 scale, some a 3.000 scale, some A, B, C, D, E, F, and some zero to a hundred. But whatever grading system one has, there is a line above which a student is in good academic standing and below which that student is on academic probation.

Every grading system has a line like that. The Convention spoke its will a moment ago on Proposal No. 24 concerning a specific grading system that was tied to a 4.000 scale. That is history. This is not tied to any scale, but it is tied to the fundamental judgment by all of our faculties that if a student is in

good standing he is doing at least minimally acceptable academic work. Only then, this amendment says, should that student be allowed to take on the heavy additional extracurricular burdens of intercollegiate athletics.

Now, to touch on Professor Cross' point just briefly. I have talked to Professor Cross and several others, but with all due respect I have not been persuaded that we do not need the clause "not on academic probation." I do not understand how a student who is on academic probation as defined by the faculty of a given college or university could also be in good academic standing. It seems to me that one is the flip side of the other, and that the other clearly defines what we mean by good academic standing and ultimately what we mean by being a student.

I would urge approval of Part A as originally drafted. It will define far more carefully than has ever been the case what is a student. It will allow us to enforce, depending on what happens with Part C, far more effectively than ever has been the case what we say it means. They are students first and athletes second.

James H. Wharton (Louisiana State University): The faculty of the various institutions specify the requirements for academic probation. This proposal would not eliminate the possibility of eligibility at a later date for a student. It just means that the student must get back in good academic standing before they continue. This is an important consideration when one looks at graduation rates. Graduation rates are important to all of us. In other words, by requiring good academic standing we will continually be moving a student toward graduation; and I urge that we reject the amendment-to-the-amendment, No. 25-1.

George A. Christenberry (Augusta College): I wish to speak in favor of No. 25-1 and to explain a situation where a student can be on probation and still make a satisfactory progress towards graduation. Any student at Augusta College is on probation if he is not maintaining the requirement for graduation. We do have minimum standards for progress from one year to the next.

What this proposal would do is set a requirement that is greater on student-athletes than on other students at Augusta College.

[Proposal No. 25-1 (page A-19) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Mr. Clark: I move adoption of Proposal No. 25-2, the amendment-to-the-amendment.

[The motion was seconded.]

This changes the effective date from immediately to August 1, 1985. We already have heard how important Parts A and B of No. 25 are and I believe it is reasonable that the implementation date be postponed until August 1, 1985, in order to provide some opportunity to put into motion No. 25, should it be approved.

[Part A of Proposal No. 25 (pages A-17-18) was approved by Divisions I and II as amended by Nos. 25-1 and 25-2.]

Mr. Foote: Mr. Chairman, No. 25-B is an effort to center accountability and responsibility for a portion of what the Convention has just passed. I think the language speaks for itself. Very briefly, the chief executive officer at the university is equipped to certify specifically and personally what is happening on the academic side.

I realize this is lifting one rule from the many rules that we must all abide by, but we consider it a fundamental rule because it touches so close to the

heart of our organization; namely, what our students are. That is why it is important to lift that out and set other responsibility and accountability directly where the buck stops. The buck stops in the university in such matters with the office of the president.

This also allows a measure of enforceability which is hitherto far more difficult. With the certification of the chief executive officer, there is only one place to go to find out whether that certification is accurate, which is why the other subparagraph was there. I urge the Convention to follow its good judgment just so clearly exercised with this additional motion which will make not only accountable but enforceable an extremely important new position in our rules.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): I would oppose the adoption of Part B of No. 25. It imposes on the institution a burden of paper work which I do not think serves a good purpose. Also, paragraph (v) in that part is suggestive of a "hit list" or something of the sort, which the NCAA might be developing if they start looking into some of our institutions by making a spot check. I hope that you would defeat this part.

L. O. Morgan (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chairman, I also oppose this amendment because it creates a real paper-work nightmare, as was pointed out. I think that it intrudes very, very heavily on the rights of deans and of our academic system, at least at our university; and we would be strongly opposed to it.

Bruce R. Poulton (North Carolina State University): I would like to inquire if the transcripts and other relevant information suggested in paragraph (v) are consistent with the student's rights to privacy as provided for in the Buckley Amendment?

Mr. Foote: They are consistent. I am as certain as I can be of a legal opinion. I think that the Buckley Amendment is one which we have to live with. We all look at our students' transcripts, we in the collective sense. We do that as a matter of course under the rules as they now exist one way or another, and I see nothing in this proposal that would in any way compromise the individual rights of the students.

Mr. Wharton: One of the biggest problems in passing academic legislation in this Convention is the extensive mistrust that institutions have for one another. It seems to me that Part B lays it right on the line. I, for one, as a chief executive officer, would prefer to be accountable to all the other chief executives for what is going on in my institution than to continue the distrust. I strongly urge that we adopt Part B of No. 25.

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): I have some trouble understanding the necessity of this particular proposal. We already have legislation on the books that provides that the chief executive officer of each institution is responsible for certifying the eligibility of all its student-athletes. The chief executive officer holds that or is empowered to delegate that to the person designated by him.

All that I see this adds is that each institution will then file this particular certification form with the Eligibility Committee. We already have a provision for the chief executive officer to indicate that he is complying with the certification process for student-athletes on his campus. It seems to me that some of the speakers are saying they cannot trust the people who work for them. That troubles me. I do not know what a senior academic official is. For those reasons, I oppose it. I think we already have all the power needed

in the chief executive officers to truly monitor the eligibility of their student-athletes.

[Part B of Proposal No. 25 (page A-18) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

[Proposals No. 25-3 (page A-19) and No. 26 (pages A-19-20) were moot due to the approval of No. 25-A.]

Transfer—Junior College

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 27-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jack R. Wentworth (Indiana University, Bloomington): I will speak against the amendment. Basically, this addresses a strong recommendation of the Select Committee, that a junior college route not be an advantage coming into a four-year institution as a freshman. What Proposal No. 27 does is to provide the same progress requirements for transfer students as for students admitted as freshmen to one of our four-year institutions. I think No. 27-1 dilutes that significantly.

[Proposal No. 27-1 (pages A-20-21) was defeated by Division I, 120-127.]

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I move adoption of Proposal No. 27-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

In discussions yesterday and the day before, it became clear to me there was what I believed to be a reasonable argument against the specific language in the proposal, which came from the Select Committee on which I served. The objection had to do with the fact that the proposal might be interpreted to require that the junior college transfer would have had to previously select a major and to be working toward a major in the specific institution to which he transferred.

This really puts it on the same level exactly as required of those who come in as freshmen by changing the language to "acceptable" toward a baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the institution rather than requiring that it be a specific program for which he has a declarative major.

[Proposal No. 27-2 (page A-21) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 27 (page A-20) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 27-1.]

Transfer—Junior College

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): On behalf of the members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 28-1, which would delete the words "accepted in a specific baccalaureate program."

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of both the amendment and the original proposal is to

accomplish exactly the same thing as was done in the previous action in No. 27—to close the loophole through the junior college that permitted a junior college student to achieve satisfactory progress in a way that was less than that required of the student in a regular four-year institution.

[Proposal No. 28-1 (page A-22) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 28 (page A-21) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 28-1.]

Satisfactory Progress—Acceptable Degree Credit.

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. President, on behalf of all 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 29-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 29-1 clarifies Proposal No. 29 by adding the three words "whichever occurs first." That should remove any ambiguity.

[Proposal No. 29-1 (page A-23) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

I would now like to speak to Proposal No. 29. This proposal is to amend Situation No. 592, which appeared on Page No. 9 of The NCAA News on May 18, 1983. It is an interpretation of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(iii). It is a carryover from the 1983 Convention where it was an interpretation of Proposal No. 56, which was supposed to clarify the hours earned or accepted for degree credit in a specific baccalaureate program.

This is a very important piece of legislation, and I think it relates to one of the more destructive—academically destructive or potentially academically destructive—situations before us if we allow this existing interpretation to proceed as it is currently worded.

The amendment proposes to change in the answer, in the fifth line, from the beginning of the third year of enrollment to the third year of athletic competition or the fourth year of enrollment. Now, going back to 1983, the purpose of this interpretation was to split the academic career into two parts; the first two years and the second two years. You could interpret any credits available for any specific degree for the first two years.

After the first two years of enrollment, you would have to have a specific baccalaureate major. Now, that sounds pretty good; but there are three things that I find wrong with this. The first is that it assumes that most of the student-athletes will have a four-year degree. This is just not so. What happens is that most student-athletes who are taking 12 credit hours per term will have 48 semester hours by the end of the second year of enrollment. Now, in my particular school, you must declare a major by the time you have 60 credits. So what this does is clarify that you must declare an upper-division major of 12 units before you get to the upper division. Now, this just cannot happen.

The second thing is that there are probably some majors that you could enter at the freshman level; but these majors require something less than some of the other more restrictive majors. What this means is that student-athletes would be diverted toward majors requiring a minimum rather than a maximum of preparation. So instead of having minimum courses, we are going to have minimum majors.

The third thing that it does is work against those who are marginal students. If you look at what could or what will happen, as it is currently interpreted, the third year will be the richer year for those students who are good enough to compete in the first and second year but not good enough academically to proceed on to a major.

Let us suppose they do not have the required prerequisites, they do not have the remedial courses finished and they need the academic third year in order to proceed to a specific major. They are going to red shirt the third year. That is not where they need to red shirt. If anything, they need to take preparation in the first year. The marginal students will have a disadvantage.

This is a very bad piece of interpretation at the present time. I think that the fix is a good one. This is the result of a hasty interpretation a year ago, and I do not think that there is a better way to fix it. I think that if I had to do it now, I could offer to the Convention that most of us interpret the time to declare a major on the basis of units. So we have a situation where we determine progress on the basis of credits passed and we determine the declaration of a major on the calendar. This is not the way to do it. I think asking for preventing the third year of athletic competition or the fourth-year enrollment is the way to go. I urge your approval of this amendment.

Douglas W. Nance (Central Michigan University): I wish to speak in opposition to this proposal. This proposal is intended to solve the problem created by legislation passed in the 1983 Convention. However, if this proposition is passed, it will create more problems than it will solve.

It will reopen the door that permits student-athletes to complete their eligibility without sufficient progress for a degree. In that sense, it partially circumvents the 1983 satisfactory-progress legislation. The declaration of a major after two years of study is significantly different than declaration of a major after three years. For those reasons and most of the reasons given in favor of the 1983 satisfactory-progress legislation, this proposal should be defeated.

[Proposal No. 29 (pages A-22-23) was defeated by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 29-1.]

Resolution: Freshman Eligibility

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): This is a resolution which is an outgrowth of a recommendation made by the Select Committee and there is certainly no issue that was dealt with in more detail and on which more time was spent than the deliberations of that measure.

As I said yesterday in the Division I round table, I, along with Dean Smith, believe the kind of activity which we require of freshmen who are participating in the team sports of football or basketball, and others as well, makes it very difficult for them to make the academic transition which they are required to make in high school to college and universities in the freshman year.

Since there is a study underway by the NCAA which will provide the data which I believe will make it clear that this legislation is important, I am withdrawing the proposal from consideration by this Convention.

[Proposal No. 30 (pages A-23-24) was withdrawn.]

Junior College Grade-Point Requirement

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am informed that this is the ordinary way that our registrars and record keepers handle repetition of courses for transfer purposes. Under our present interpretation, if a person, for instance, took a course twice and failed it both times, he then would end up with 10 hours of failure for a five-hour course. If he failed it once and passed it once, he would end up, in a sense, with five hours of failure on his transfer record and five hours of pass on his transfer record. That really does not make very much sense. It seems to me this identifies how this particular problem shall be handled. I very seriously urge the adoption of this proposal.

Richard W. Burns (University of Texas, El Paso): Harry, if a person received a C in a particular course, took it over and received a D the second time, the last one counts?

Mr. Cross: I would say so, yes.

[Proposal No. 31 (page A-24) was approved.]

Principles of Sound Academic Standards

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): I move to amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(3) as indicated in Proposal No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 32 is to provide that graduate students who are otherwise ineligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics at Division II and Division III member colleges are permitted to do so within the first 10 semesters or 15 quarters of full-time college residence, which is the same period of time that eligibility is allowed to Divisions II and III undergraduates according to Bylaw 4-1.

It makes sense to the sponsors of this proposal that there be consistency in the application of the 10-semester-hour rule to both undergraduate and graduate students at Division II and Division III levels.

[Proposal No. 32 (pages A-24-25) was approved.]

Eligibility—2.000 Rule

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

Most of our rules are designed to inhibit persons in our institutions who are academically deficient. This will permit the persons in our institution under some regular admission program who are not academically deficient but did not graduate from high school to participate during the first year at the institution.

At one of the Catholic high schools in Seattle, there is sort of an advanced-pace program; and they finish all the ordinary prerequisites for college and they get in the University of Washington basically at what we would think as their junior year in high school. One of those students, a young lady, wanted to turn out for one of the sports and could not. I do not know how many times this is likely to happen; but it seemed to me to be rather outrageous that a person who got in under high standards could not participate, yet someone who hung around for another year and graduated, a minimum high school

graduate, could get in and participate. This merely says if a person gets in our institution in an accelerated program in high school has a minimum of 3.500 on a 4.00 scale they immediately are eligible even though they have not graduated from high school.

[Proposal No. 33 (pages A-25-26) was approved by Division I.]

Eligibility—2.000 Rule

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of Proposal No. 34, which is companion legislation, recognizing the change in our high school requirements.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 34 (page A-26) was approved by Division I.]

Board of Presidents

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

Eugene J. McDonald (Duke University): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of No. 35-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would request that because No. 35-1 proposes a lesser modification of Proposal No. 35 than does No. 35-2, that Proposal No. 35-2 be taken up prior to No. 35-1.

President Toner: It is a close call. The chair, unless otherwise directed, would allow the reordering of No. 35-1 and No. 35-2.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 35-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Derek C. Bok (Harvard University): As the first speaker, I would like in a few words to put this proposal in a larger context in preparation for more detailed speeches which I am sure will follow.

President Toner: Excuse me, President Bok. You are speaking to No. 35-2?

Mr. Bok: Yes, I am speaking in support of the amendment, but for reasons that pertain to all of Proposal No. 35.

President Toner: Proceed.

Mr. Bok: We all know that athletics have become a very major force in our society; and we are all aware of the benefits that are brought to our institutions, our athletes and to the spectators that watch our contests. I think we also recognize that intercollegiate athletics have a momentum, a power that often makes it hard to keep them fully consistent with the academic purposes and goals of our institutions.

We sometimes try to overlook those conflicts and it is terribly tempting to do so. But if we look carefully at the athletes who we admit, how they came to us, how much time our athletic programs often demand of them and at what costs to their academic efforts and to their possibilities for graduation, we all recognize, I think, that we have a substantial problem; and it is that problem and that concern which brought a group of presidents together more than 18 months ago to try to help in doing something about it.

We have made some progress, I think, in the intervening time. As we reflected last summer on that experience, we came to the conclusion that there were three alternatives among which we had to choose. One was to

continue as we were, an ad-hoc committee as the marshals of the NCAA, not in close touch with its governing structure. That seemed to us not a healthy thing in the long run for the benefit of this organization.

We could also try to advocate the presence of more presidents on the NCAA Council. But that also seems an ineffective means of greater presidential participation because the time demands are extraordinary, too great for the vast majority of the Presidents; and most of the matters taken up by the Council, important though they are, are not matters in which presidents have special expertise.

So we came to this third alternative of creating a Board of Presidents with meaningful powers, but powers limited to those matters of particular concern to presidents over which presidents have ultimate responsibility. Over the past weeks, and particularly in the past few days, we have tried with these amendments that are before you to speak to that. We have tried in every way we knew how to adjust our proposals as far as we could to fit the traditions and procedures of the NCAA and to accommodate ourselves as comfortably as we could to that process while achieving a meaningful role for presidents.

There are two principles essential to a meaningful role for presidents on which we cannot compromise. One is that membership on any Board of Presidents must be chosen by presidents as a whole and not by any small group preselected by the NCAA.

Our second principle is that presidents should at least have some limited power to act and not just offer advice or rearrange agendas or talk about studies—some limited power to act subject to the overall will of this Convention, but some limited power to act on matters as important to the ultimate responsibilities of presidents as academic standards and the maintenance of financial stability.

Now, you cannot create a board without observing those two principles. I do not believe that you will find that such a board will command the genuine spirit and confidence of the majority of chief executives of institutions of higher learning throughout this country. I also doubt that any provision which does not respect these two principles will ultimately be convincing to the outside world, because in the glow of bowl games and other important victories there is a large public out there which I, and I think most people in this room, have repeatedly discovered—a large public that knows that there are things amiss in the world of intercollegiate athletics.

There are compromises that should not be made with the academic purposes of our institution, and these people feel that those in charge of those academic institutions that all of us in this room represent are not acting decisively enough to put our houses in order. That public will not be fooled by any carefully contrived adjustment that appears to do something without really committing itself to a genuine partnership for progress.

We come here not in rancor accusing anyone, but suggesting a new partnership, a new beginning, a new opportunity for all of us to work together to overcome some important problems for the great laws of intercollegiate athletics and for our institutions and for, most of all, our students. I hope that we will find a way to take full advantage of that opportunity and move forward together in fruitful partnership and make the progress that we so badly need.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the speakers really want to be

speaking to No. 35, and I believe we should move to the decision on the amendments and allow us then to talk about No. 35, as amended. I, therefore, call for the previous question on the amendment.

[The motion to cease debate on Proposal No. 35-2 was approved.]

[Proposal No. 35-2 (pages A-40-42) was approved.]

Mr. McDonald: The intended effect of the proposed amendment No. 35-1 is to keep the central and definable core of Proposal No. 35, but to eliminate the less vital, less definable and more troublesome portions of it.

Very simply, the amendment would do three things and three things only. It would limit the jurisdiction of the Board of Presidents to matters significantly affecting academic standards only. It would delete the provision granting the Board of Presidents the power to approve the appointment of and to evaluate and review the performance of the executive director and his staff; and, third, it would add a provision preventing the votes of the Board of Presidents to be cast by proxies.

Why, then, do we propose to limit the jurisdiction of the Board of Presidents? We have long supported greater presidential involvement in the NCAA affairs. Our own president, Terry Sanford, publicly proposed this first NCAA presidents' meeting in Kansas City some three years ago. You must distinguish, of course, the direct and indirect presidential involvement and realize there is already total indirect presidential involvement in NCAA matters as measured by standards of responsibility in their capacities as institutional chief executive officers.

Proposal No. 35, on the other hand, would create a mechanism for the direct involvement of presidents as presidents. That is a mechanism for the direct assertion and imposition of presidential values on NCAA practices and policies. We support this assertion of presidential values and the mechanism of Proposal No. 35 to make it possible. But our amendment would limit the reach of this extraordinary power and the jurisdiction of the Board of Presidents quite sharply.

It would limit it to matters significantly affecting academic standards. That is to matters which are central to institutions of values and purpose, and, therefore, central to its creator, the NCAA. It would limit it to matters which are definable and not subject to misunderstanding; it would limit it to matters that none of this membership fear but indeed should welcome and embrace the greater assertions of presidential values.

The second significant part of our proposed amendment No. 35-1 would delete the provisions giving the Board of Presidents a role in the selection and evaluation of the executive director and his staff. Under any version of Proposal No. 35, the roles given or assigned to a Board of Presidents are as monitoring value-setting group; and we do not think that management of the NCAA's administrative structure should be one of them. We do not think it is appropriate. We think it goes too far and is not administratively proper.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, we request a division of the amendment, separating out the portion which would, as has been indicated, remove the authority of the board to review and appoint the executive director of the NCAA. On that portion to that amendment, the proposers of No. 35 have no objection. We do object to the remainder of the proposed amendment, however.

Mr. McDonald: We will accept that division.

Charley Scott (Mississippi State University): I have been concerned about

intercollegiate athletics in a major sort of way for 15 meetings of this Convention, not just for the last 18 months. I know that after these meetings at other times many of you have come to me and you have made such statements as, "I appreciate what you have said. You have made me conclude that I was thinking rightly. You said what I was thinking, but I could not put it into words. What you said needed to be said," and on and on in a similar tone. Today I hope I can measure up to some of those thoughts that were expressed in prior years as a kind of influence, because I think we face a serious issue in NCAA governance.

I will speak to one point at this point in time and to others as they arise. Yesterday in the Division I round table, I raised a question to Chancellor Young and preceded it by some statements such as these: I am accustomed to my president being responsible for the total university, not just a part of it. Proposal No. 35 started out with some ambiguous definitions of areas of responsibility, but to me those ambiguous areas could be interpreted to make the board responsible for anything within the NCAA operation. Now, we are considering a reduction in that scope. I think we can by passing these amendments put the board of presidents, if it becomes one, in a position of forfeiting responsibilities that I do not think they should forfeit.

For some time, I have held a notion that one of the roots of the problems that I refer to has been the forfeiting of that responsibility by chief executive officers. Proposal No. 35 already was quite lengthy, and it was hard enough to try to understand it in that framework. Now, we have some rather lengthy amendments that we are facing and seeing almost for the first time this morning.

It has been stated by the proposers that there are substantial changes in those amendments. I would urge you to defeat all of those amendments.

Mr. Young: I rise in opposition to the portion of No. 35-1 which would remove the authority of the proposed Board of Presidents to deal with matters affecting the financial stability of the member institutions. Certainly, we as presidents and chancellors have total responsibility for all the operations of our institutions and certainly, in an ultimate sense, for the operation of the total intercollegiate athletic program.

But we believe that the two areas that are of critical importance to the members, to the presidents and chancellors, and, therefore, that need to be dealt with by them as members of this board, are academic standards and those financial matters which would affect the financial stability of the member institutions. We, therefore, urge a defeat of that part of this proposed amendment which would change Proposal No. 35 in that regard.

Mr. McDonald: A point of clarification. The part we are now voting on is the part that deals with the limitation of the jurisdiction of the Board of Presidents to matters affecting the academic standards. Is that correct?

President Toner: That is correct.

Mr. Young: Could I now move to separate the voting by proxy? It was certainly the intention of those who drafted Proposal No. 35 that voting by proxy not be allowed. We certainly would have no objection to that being included in this amendment.

Mr. McDonald: We would support Chancellor Young's proposal as to have a separate vote on the voting by proxy provision as well.

President Toner: If there is no objection, we will accept that.

Stanley E. McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): I wish to express

opposition to this portion of the proposed amendment which limits the power of the Board of Presidents to academic standards and removes any responsibility for financial integrity or the reputation of the member institutions. It seems to me this is removing much of the heart of the power and authority of the Board of Presidents.

I know there are many in this body who do not favor Proposal No. 35, but I would suggest and request that you vote on it on its merits. I believe it would be a hollow victory which would be virtually meaningless if No. 35 were passed but limited only to authority over academic matters and not having authority over financial integrity or the reputation of the institution, authority which is inherent in the very position of responsibility of the president or chief executive officer of an institution.

Mr. McDonald: Just for purposes of clarification in what has become a somewhat complex procedure, are we voting first upon that provision which would limit the jurisdictional reach of the Board of Presidents to matters affecting the academic standards?

President Toner: That is correct.

[Changes proposed in Section 2 and paragraph (a), subparagraph (4) of Proposal No. 35-1 (page A-38) were defeated.]

[Changes proposed in paragraph (c) and subparagraph (3) of Proposal No. 35-1 (page A-39) were approved.]

[Changes proposed in paragraph (i) and subparagraph (7) and Part B of Proposal No. 35-1 (page A-39) were approved.]

Marvin D. Johnson (University of New Mexico): Mr. President, I rise to speak against Proposal No. 35, as amended. First, I would like to quote from some of the mail that has been generated by the American Council on Education and other organizations to "Dear Colleagues". Your "colleague" means your president if you are not aware of it. Some of you have not seen this mail unless it has been shared by your President.

Let me quote. "Most important, do the presidents compromise the one institution—one vote democratic charter of the NCAA?" That is the question. Let me give you the ACE response. "Much of the work of the NCAA is now carried out in committees, and the Board of Presidents can be seen as a major policy-making extension of that very satisfactory practice."

If anybody in this room thinks that the Board of Presidents is going to play like any other NCAA committee, they believe in Santa Claus. Now, I have been my institution's delegate to both the ACE Convention in Toronto and the State Universities and of Land-Grant Colleges meeting in Washington this fall. You have seen and heard that these two organizations have taken a definite stand in the official positions of those organizations.

Let me submit that not either organization took the trouble to poll their membership on this proposition that comes before you today. They did it with a small group of people—their board, their executive committee appointed of 35 people. In fact, at the Land-Grant Colleges meeting, during the senate meeting when all representatives of all member institutions were in the same room, they were not allowed to take a vote on whether they favored No. 35 or not.

I submit to you that this proposition, if passed, will bring the same type of situation that caused those two organizations to take that stand. The town meeting that we are holding here today on intercollegiate athletics in America would be a thing of the past. I have been amazed at the number of

professional staff members from the ACE and Land-Grant association who have been working this Convention on a regular basis the last three or four days. Maybe we should go to Washington and lobby them. I think it is a new wrinkle to have somebody from Washington to come to Dallas to lobby us. They have done a pretty good job. I say to you delegates today, I urge you to vote no. This is a small paddle, but it is still your paddle; it is your university's paddle. You can put it up or down the way you want it; say you will not give it to 44 people who will make decisions behind closed doors shielded from the press, and from whom you will learn about the decision when they tell you about it and not before.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I would like to do two things, Mr. Chairman. Number one, I would like to conceptualize the reasons why I am supporting No. 35; and then, secondly, I would like to identify four major reasons why No. 36, allegedly the flip side of the coin, is not the answer.

Let's go back and begin with No. 35. For years, the American public, the higher education system and even the athletes themselves have sporadically, if not forcefully enough, decried the manner in which the NCAA manages its affairs associated with student-athletes at our college and university campuses. The professionalization of big-time athletics on the campus is a matter of fact. It has existed for years. Because of the de facto abrogation of responsibility on the part of chief executive officers and others, including athletic directors and faculty representatives on numerous campuses nationally, and because of the historical bureaucratization of this professionalization process within the hierarchical structure of the NCAA, we have what we have today—one big mess.

It is no one person or party's fault, because we have all individually and collectively been involved in this scenario. That is, again, athletic directors, coaches, chancellors, alumni and, of course, the staff of the NCAA. Hence, all parties concerned are to some degree both individually and collectively to blame. We are now asking for only one thing, the responsibility that gave the support necessary to ensure the possibility for cleaning up the mess.

That means once and for all that the presidents and chancellors of these institutions must be given the role of assuming responsibility for taking their proper roles in relationship to the control of so-called big-time athletics in the arena of these Divisions I, II and III. Now, as indicated earlier, Proposal No. 35 clearly is, as we see it, the means whereby we can achieve that end.

Now, within the scope of its authority, the board certainly can offer advice to appropriate bodies of the NCAA and its committees. That is as a Board of Presidents. We think that it is time for those of us who support Proposal No. 35 to have support from those who perhaps are just simply on the fence. The time has come for this Association to rally around the flag of the concept of a Board of Presidents, which by virtue of its very existence can assist sports and regain some semblance of credibility within the eyes of the public, and ultimately, the students who we suggest we are here to support.

The institutionalization of an Alice in Wonderland process such as that which currently exists must once and for all be abrogated. We envision that the only way we are going to find light at the end of the tunnel is through the enactment of Proposal No. 35, as amended. It may not be the total answer, but it is certainly more than just simply a foot in the door.

Now, with respect to the flip side of the coin, or Proposal No. 36, I would

suggest the following five reasons why it should be opposed in relation to the consideration of support for Proposal No. 35.

No. 1, it is a degradation of the democratization process. If you check Appendix B in your program, you note that it codifies the utilization of the NCAA as the body, and the only body, which ultimately makes the major decision regarding the competition of the so-called Commission of Presidents.

No. 2, in the negative, the Commission is advisory in nature. Under the Council's proposal, the Commission has advisory input only and has no decision-making enactment power. In contrast, Proposal No. 35, with the ultimate approval of this body, has more than just simple advisory input.

No. 3, there are those who would go so far as to even suggest that Appendix B can be viewed as manipulatable in nature, because it perpetuates the bureaucratic status quo of the NCAA and it guarantees the firm control of the decision-making process in the hands of the NCAA's Council and its supporters.

Additionally, the three-page sheet that the Council distributed today, which, by the way, I just saw an hour ago, uses and makes reference to the so-called federated structure. True, the federated structure is used; but it still is a fact that the NCAA calls the shots with regard to the ultimate composition of the so-called Commission of Presidents.

No. 4 is that, deny it or not, No. 36 in the final analysis is nothing more than a politically contrived 11th-hour response to No. 35. Let's face it, if No. 35 had not been proposed, No. 36 would not exist. Additionally, there are those, including myself, who suggest that in effect Proposal No. 36 is an attempt at cooptation.

Finally, No. 5, in opposition to No. 36 as the flip side of the coin, the NCAA Council is endorsing the concept of No. 36 knowing full well that that endorsement runs completely counter and contrary to the opposition of a significant number of chief executive officers and others in this audience in Divisions I, II and III.

Paul Hardin (Drew University): I came here undecided. I now speak in favor of Proposal No. 35, and I hope to change the tone of the debate just a bit.

I have listened and I now speak in favor in the balance without any highly partisan feelings. In fact, some of you may have noticed that if No. 36 should become the law, I am one of the presidents who would be serving as a member of the nominating committee under that machinery. So I rise without suspicion of the motives of either side of this debate, hoping we can focus on the merits.

The vote of my institution, Drew University, will not be a no-confidence vote against the officers or the Council of the NCAA, and certainly not against athletic directors. It is a vote that enlists presidents as more active partners than before with the NCAA Council, with athletic directors and with all of us who want to promote intercollegiate athletics and protect intercollegiate athletics from pressures and grave abuses which threaten the essential academic values.

I was one of many presidents in this room who did not like No. 35, frankly, when it first emerged. I wrote its sponsors to that effect immediately. Proposal No. 35-2 cures, in my view, the substantive defects and it seems to me converts No. 35 from an unintentionally divisive proposal into legislation

which offers great hope for cooperation.

Let us forgive the awkward beginning and let us support No. 35. Let us go out of here with a clear signal that presidents care and with a mechanism which as now amended enables presidents to set a tone and to take initiatives but does not turn things upside down in such an abrupt way as to be interpreted as failing to recognize the many good decisions which have been made over the years under present governance structures. My university will support Proposal No. 35.

James H. Wharton (Louisiana State University): Many statements have been made at this Convention that concern me greatly, perhaps more than the issue that we face. Proposal No. 35 is a slap in the face to the athletic directors and faculty representatives. It leaves nothing for these personnel to do. Finally, the responsibilities and details are more than the presidents can take home.

As President Bok said earlier, the ad-hoc committee that has worked on this as member institutions of the NCAA has given careful detail to the question of what issues we should take up and how we can most constructively serve this organization. Now, anyone who looks at the program for this Convention knows that there is plenty for the athletic directors and faculty representatives to take care of. The presidents are not competent to deal with topics like championships, recruiting, division criteria, amateurism, playing seasons and practice sessions. That is why we have very competent athletic directors and faculty representatives. The claim that Proposal No. 35 will take away from the faculty representatives and from the athletic directors is just not true.

Finally, I would like to say that however No. 35 comes out, I hope this does not lead to a confrontation between chief executive officers, namely presidents and chancellors, and athletic directors and faculty representatives. That would be a real shame.

Ariss L. Roaden (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against Proposal No. 35. It is not a role which I cherish. Many of those who have proposed No. 35 are colleagues with whom I have worked in other contexts for the betterment of all of higher education. But this legislation is terribly wrong.

It has substantive flaws. Amendments which have been added do not remove the fundamental fallacy of substituting the decisions and actions of a few presidents for the collective wisdom of the Convention delegates. The power to enact legislation or suspend the actions of the Convention cannot be corrected by changing terminology from suspend to temporarily delay.

The result is the same. The will of the Convention is aborted. Proposal No. 35 is based on some false assumptions. The first assumption is that presidents do not have the time to attend NCAA Conventions. The second assumption is not only do they not have the time, they do not have the interest relative to most issues which are considered at the Convention.

The third assumption is that the presidents cannot trust their athletic directors and faculty representatives to represent the best interests of the institution. Now, it is incongruous to me that you can move from those three premises to the conclusion that presidents, therefore, have the time and interest to be a governing board. Such legislation would impede, not enhance, presidential involvement.

There is no need to debate the issues on the Convention floor; there is no

need to even attend because it is something of a play-school context. What you do is stay at home and then call your board after the Convention is over.

Furthermore, a great problem with Proposal No. 35 is the potential that it might weaken the enforcement of the NCAA. Yes, indeed, there are problems in intercollegiate athletics. Those problems are on the campuses. They are not in the governance of the NCAA. The NCAA has a most important function and that is to exercise enforcement and help us get our houses in order. Anything that takes away from the strength of all the member universities of NCAA convened together as a group like this will sap every function of the NCAA, including that important one.

Finally, no matter how you try, we are left with the appearance that one organization in which we hold membership and to which we pay dues, namely, the American Council on Education, has concluded that another organization in which we hold membership and to which we pay dues somehow is incapable of governing itself. Therefore, it is incumbent on Organization A to conceive a plan and transport it to Organization B. It will not work. I, for one, am very weary of paying dues to one organization and have it fight another organization to which I am paying dues. For all of these reasons and many more, I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 35.

Very Rev. J. Donald Monan (Boston College): I have been a member of the ACE panel of presidents from its earliest days. I am also chairman of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, which represents all 900 private colleges and universities in this country, although I did not judge it appropriate to ask that body's endorsement for or opposition to any of today's business.

Today I speak in opposition to a proposal generated by our ACE panel, Proposal No. 35. I frankly do not relish opposing this proposal because I profoundly respect the efforts and success of our panel over the past two years. However, as one of the few members of a panel opposed to the proposal, I would hope that my perspective can be of some help to those who remain undecided.

My reservations regarding the establishment in No. 35 of the Board of Presidents with policy-making authority within the NCAA have been three. First, I believe that it made little constitutional sense to confer on two radically different bodies, namely, a board of 44 presidents and an assembly of all the hundreds of member presidents and their representatives the same legislative power over crucial organizational bylaws, policies and regulations.

Secondly, I believe that the establishment of such a policy-making board could have an effect exactly opposite to the most desirable goal we intended. Everyone who has spoken on the subject has pointed up the insufficient involvement of the majority of presidents in activities of the NCAA and the necessity of rekindling that involvement.

For my part, I firmly believe that the election of a 44-member Board of Presidents with authentic legislative power over the most critical of NCAA policies will further exonerate the hundreds of other busy presidents from involving themselves in NCAA business. If we were too often negligent before, I fear we will be more so when we can be confident that our 44 elected colleagues will take care of the critical academic and fiscal matters and our representatives will take care of the more purely athletic matters.

Thirdly, whether on the part of individual panel presidents or the ACE staff, I cannot say, but Proposal No. 35 clearly arose from the assumption

that recent problems of intercollegiate athletics were traceable to influences of certain established interests or personalities concerning the NCAA. It is also difficult to deal head-on with presumptions of this type since they are put forth without substantiation and too often stem from one's personal experience or observations. For my own part, I believe that we would be seriously deceiving ourselves if we were to attribute the problems that have beset intercollegiate athletics to the organizational structures or established interests of the NCAA. The problems of dismal academic achievements and of questionable degree programs and of lower graduation rates among athletes and nonathletes have much more to do with changing admissions practices and divergent educational philosophies and social policies of our individual campuses than the organizational structure of the NCAA.

Now, it is true that the force of these three reservations have been modified to some degree by successive redrafts of Proposal No. 35. Today's amendments go still further towards homogenizing Proposal Nos. 35 and 36. The successive revisions of the amendments have made them more similar, but we must still make a choice between them. I would like to propose four criteria which should determine our vote for Proposal No. 35 or No. 36.

First, our choice of structure must be such that it continues the effective role that the ACE Committee of Presidents has exercised over the past two years. The concerns manifested by these presidents and their effectiveness in strengthening legislation must not be allowed to disappear. We need an instrument that will allow a smaller body of knowledgeable and concerned presidents to exert leadership and to serve as a specialized resource for all members of the NCAA. Presumably both Nos. 35 and 36 would meet this criterion. This will not be true of the remaining three.

Secondly, our choice of structure must be directed towards achieving a greater personal involvement on the part of all university presidents in the policy-making activity of the NCAA. We must choose an instrument that will encourage rather than diminish the responsibility of all presidents to keep themselves aware of the issues involved in conducting academically sound and ethically respectable athletic programs and to make their voice heard on those issues in the voting process of the NCAA.

Third, if we have been through a painful period in recent years, and we have, whatever action we take to increase this presidential involvement should serve to bring us together in concerted effort rather than to divide us. A system of vetoes and overrides may serve the differing legislative and executive branches of our Federal government, but the division that may presuppose I do not regard as a proficient relationship between a 44-member of the Board of Presidents and the remaining presidential colleagues.

Last, my final criterion consists of the danger that we must forestall. I take it that no one in this audience needs to be convinced of the importance of a strong, effective national organ of regulating intercollegiate athletics. Given the radical differences and functional character and academic programs and admissions standards of our many hundreds of members and the pressures existing upon them, the establishment of any such standards for intercollegiate athletics is enormously difficult.

The forces pulling us apart are powerful. I believe that anything that increases internal division within the NCAA would weaken the capacity to exercise authentic governance and would contribute to producing a more regrettable situation in intercollegiate athletics than anything we have ever

experienced in the last painful years.

On the basis of these four criteria, therefore, I recommend the establishment of a Commission as proposed in Proposal No. 36, as it will be amended. Such a body would guarantee a meaningful role for a smaller group of elected presidents. It would leave the policy-making authority of the Convention uncontested by any other rival body, and it would challenge all presidents to increase their involvement in the management of intercollegiate athletics. If, after several years, the governance structure of the Convention itself is found on the basis of evidence to be unresponsive and, therefore, must be handed over to another group, there will be time enough and document experience enough to make that change.

Mr. McCaffrey: For all the differences of view expressed not only on the floor this morning but in the past days and weeks, there are four areas on which there is, I believe, virtually unanimous agreement.

The first of these is the agreement that chief executive officers—presidents and chancellors—have the responsibility for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics at their institutions and nationally. Second, that chief executive officers should have the authority to exercise that responsibility. Third, we have been hearing throughout virtually every comment made this morning and throughout the past 20 years, to my knowledge and experience, to encourage more active participation on the part of presidents and chancellors; there is complete agreement on that point. Fourth, we are agreed that although the opportunity has existed for participation of presidents and chancellors, the existing mechanisms have not been effective. The evidence of this fact is clear through the proposals of both No. 35 and No. 36. The question is what we should do to encourage and provide the mechanisms whereby chief executive officers will take a more active role in the governance of the intercollegiate athletics. I believe that mechanism is Proposal No. 35.

Like Paul Hardin who spoke a moment ago, I had absolutely nothing to do with the development of this proposal. In fact, like Paul, when I first read it I thought it was presumptuous and that it was illogical in creating a new body to superimpose on the NCAA. But, as I have reflected on the purpose of encouraging and providing the mechanism for increased participation of chief executive officers, I have concluded this is the way to go.

Let us consider for a moment the existing organization if we defeated both No. 35 and No. 36. Obviously, it has not worked. Surely, the opportunity is there for participation of chief executive officers. But throughout the history of more than 60 years of the NCAA there has not been active, effective, meaningful participation by chief executive officers.

Proposal No. 36 may offer a glimmer of hope, but it would create purely an advisory body. You may say what you wish to about its powers. I do not believe that it would encourage active, meaningful participation on the part of chief executive officers. This leaves the Board of Presidents. I am respectful of the views expressed by my colleague President Monan, but this is an opportunity. This represents, I believe, our very best chance at this time, a proposal not perfect, but one that comes from a very representative group of leading university presidents, persons with whom rests the responsibility for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics in their own institutions and, collectively, nationally.

Let me comment for a moment on the effect on the NCAA of the creation

of the Board of Presidents if No. 35 should be approved. I believe that rather than demeaning or diminishing the strength or importance of the NCAA, the Council and its committees, the proposal would enhance and strengthen those bodies. Why? Because you would have more active interest and participation on the part of presidents. They, in turn, would be better informed and more actively involved with the NCAA. After all, may I remind all of us that the NCAA is a creature of the American colleges and universities. We created it. Now we would be arranging a Board of Presidents related to the NCAA and breathing more active interest and participation of the presidents into the NCAA organization.

I believe, my friends, that this offers us a hope which we have not had or which is not presented in any other proposal—to encourage active participation of presidents and chancellors and to thus strengthen our governance system of intercollegiate athletics.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): I would like to speak on behalf of my own university and the 13 other state universities in the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference. Mr. Chairman, I speak against No. 35 and ask that the members of the Convention consider two important issues.

We have heard some discussion this morning about values. I certainly cannot argue with my colleagues who suggest that we have a responsibility to clarify values and make clear our position regarding the role of intercollegiate athletics in relationship to the academic integrity of our institutions. What I would ask my colleagues and members of the Convention to recognize is that the issue of values clarification should begin on our respective campuses. I have great trouble understanding the rationale that if the 44-member board would be created that somehow miraculously the values issue would go away and disappear. I suggest that we must concentrate on our own campuses. As presidents of universities and colleges we have the prime responsibility to assist our faculty, our administration and our students to clarify their own values and put things in proper perspective.

Secondly, and perhaps even more importantly for me in terms of the organization structure, I have a fundamental problem with Proposal No. 35 in the 44-member board. If you look carefully at the makeup of the board, Division II institutions will have or possibly could have 11 representatives. If you follow Robert's Rules of Order, six presidents would be in attendance and make decisions which affect the status of Division II institutions. I have a fundamental problem with that. I see it as a difficulty down the road.

The final point I would make is that we have heard a lot about the failure of presidents in the past to be concerned with intercollegiate athletics. I, like my colleagues, am very sensitive to that criticism. The fact of the matter is it is the president's responsibility to make time to meet with athletic directors or, in a direct fashion in terms of input to this Convention, to make known their feelings and their positions on important issues that not only affect athletics but affect academics.

For many of us, it has worked in the past and it has worked well. This organization is without flaw; and I think if the debate does anything this morning, it may show that the process of the debate is better than the outcome, because it has heightened our awareness and brought us together on some very important issues.

Again, I don't think No. 35 is the answer and neither does the Pennsylvania

State University system. So, therefore, we are in opposition to No. 35 and we would strongly support the movement in No. 36.

Luna I. Mishoe (Delaware State College): Mr. President, I speak in support of Proposal No. 35. In the first place, I would make it clear that I would not support any proposition which would tend to suggest that we do not recognize this Convention as the supreme body for this organization and request that we recognize and that we should not and would not attempt to do anything that was not desired or wished by this general Convention. I think that that point should remain clear.

Regardless of what we read six weeks ago, I think that the issues as amended are the matters before us at this time; and we should not try to taint them with previous declarations about the matter.

Now, in my opinion, there is a need for a Board of Presidents to carry out the limited responsibilities suggested here—that is, to deal with academic matters and with financial matters. You will observe this morning that most of our time prior to considering No. 35 was spent dealing with or attempting to deal with academic matters, satisfactory progress and eligibility, and that kind of thing. I believe that we need a group who will give full attention to the critical academic matters of this Convention which we have to put into place and must be in place even better than what is supposed to be in place by 1986. There is a lot of work yet to be done. The matter of satisfactory progress is not settled. The matter of academic eligibility is not settled. The matter of interpretation and the application of test results is not settled.

Also, the matter of the jurisdiction of this body over academic matters with respect to the individual institutions has not been settled, and the matter of participation in the process by the various institutions has not been settled. I certainly do not want to rehash the matters of last year, but one year ago we got very highly emotional in dealing with academic matters. I believe the criticisms about what was done here last year rested on the point that an equitable and equal opportunity for input by all categories of the membership was not provided.

Now, I have worked a year since that time with this body; and I am reasonably sure that from this day on, if No. 35 is adopted, the opportunity for all of our institutions to participate in this process will be provided. We need to do research on academic matters. We need to get our statistical information correct. We need to sort it out and we need to present it in a highly intelligible and irrefutable form so that we will know what we are doing. I believe that a Board of Presidents with authority to get this job done is needed at this time. I am satisfied that with the involvement and the nomination process that would take place if No. 35 is passed, this would be the proper direction to go. I urge that we support Proposal No. 35.

Rev. Timothy Healy (Georgetown University): Mr. Chairman, sometimes legislative proposals pick up a character which is accidental to their actual being. This particular proposal has picked up the character of an adversary proposal to the NCAA and that puts it sort of in the position of Abraham Lincoln's story about the farmer who was running a horse across some slippery ground, and as the horse tried to hold his footing he put his forefoot into the stirrup and the farmer said to him, "Friend, if you are getting on, I am getting off."

The purpose here is not really to structure anything that is not subject to the NCAA Convention, and at the same time it is a structure of a brand new

voice. We have adversaries enough. Within the next two or three years, higher education—colleges and universities—is going to be belted with exactly the same scrutiny that we have watched the high schools experience for the next two or three years. The studies are already started, and we are next. We are going to pass, I think, in a lot of press and public and governmental reports ranging from whether or not Johnny can read to whether or not he can read when he has got a degree. Part of the problem we are all going to be facing and that are clearly in store for American higher education over the next two or three years concern our athletics and the integrity of the athletic program of kids who are students and athletes.

The purpose of this proposal is not to get anybody on or anybody off, but to get a kind of new voice and direction within the deliberations of the NCAA. Proposal No. 35 has two strong elements which I think we will ignore, to our loss. The first is that in order to get presidents and chancellors to work seriously, they have to have some authority. The authority No. 35 confers is minimal. They can force delay and reconsideration. But this is an enormous value in that it puts a body of presidents able to say to the Convention why not take six to eight months and think about this one again.

The second strength of No. 35 is that the NCAA will be able to say to all the world and to anyone who criticizes us that these presidents were elected by the 900 member presidents. It is the most fully democratic way to elect them, and our problem here is not that we have a democratic process or a just one, but essentially that we be seen to have a democratic process. For those two reasons, I would urge the support of Proposal No. 35.

Richard M. Bay (University of Oregon): I will be brief, and as the athletic director of Oregon, the one without tenure, this could be my last appearance before this Convention. (Laughter.) I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 35, but at the same time I want to say that I am very much in favor of far more involvement by chief executive officers in intercollegiate athletics. I submit that the mechanism for such involvement is already there. It is already on our campuses. As the athletic director at Oregon, I sit down with my president, our faculty representative and our primary woman administrator before every one of these Conventions; we decide together and with the direction of the president how Oregon will cast its vote at these Conventions.

I submit that if every college and university across this nation did the same thing before every Convention, the presidents would have ultimate control of what happens at these Conventions; and that is as it should be. But they would have control without in any way impinging upon the principle of one vote for one university. Therefore, I advocate the defeat of Proposal No. 35.

Otis A. Singletary (University of Kentucky): Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak against Proposal No. 35 and in favor of No. 36, which is yet to come before you. Before I do that, however, as I listened to the rhetoric here of what we have heard so far, it does seem to me there are some clarifications that ought to be made.

The first of those is in the spirit I think Paul Hardin suggested earlier. One thing that can be eliminated, in my opinion, from the tone of these debates is what I would call the lurking devil theory out there, that somehow bad people are involved in these activities for all kinds of motives. I think you can leave out sponsoring institutions and personalities in this debate for the advantage of everybody. What you have are two different points of view that are reflected in two different proposals and made by people who really believe in

them. Let me say this, because I am speaking against the ACE proposal and because if your memories are not that long, you should know that I was once a vice-president of the American Council on Education. I have been closer to it than many people in this room and probably have more continuing interest in it than people in this room. It is a valuable organization in my life and in the life of my institution, and I suspect in the lives of all the institutions represented here today. I generally am supportive of ACE initiatives. In this particular case, I simply do not find myself in agreement with the organization; and, therefore, I am speaking against it because I think it happens to be wrong.

Another thing I think we might as well face is that as you look at the conflicting proposals in front of you, the issue is not that some people believe that all is well in intercollegiate athletics and others believe that all is not well. So far as I have been able to determine in talking to the presidents I know, all of them, or almost all of them, are convinced that all is not well in intercollegiate athletics. I think that is one reason that you see a heightened interest by presidents in this business.

Also, I do not believe that the issue out there is whether or not you believe that past performance or participation by the presidents in this organization has been particularly effective. I think most of us agree that it has left a great deal to be desired. I do not really believe that is the issue, nor do I believe that either of these proposals deal exclusively with that.

Last of all, I do not think the issue is whether or not you need some mechanism to put the presidents more directly into the participatory role. I believe both proposals do that. What is at issue, though, is the form of the mechanism—its structure, its authority and the power that would be bestowed upon it.

I think we need not look any further for what the real issue is. You have two proposals, one being sponsored by the American Council and one by the NCAA Council, although I am quick to say that I do not look at myself here as necessarily supporting the NCAA Council. I think the NCAA Council is supporting the Select Committee that sent this forward.

I will say this for you. I have had the privilege of serving both on the Select Committee and on the council of presidents, or the committee of presidents, of the ACE, the arenas in which these two conflicting proposals might be said to have originated. I have from the beginning been troubled by certain aspects of Proposal No. 35, which I will address very briefly, and I have favored Proposal No. 36 because of its rejection of what we felt were extreme features in the other proposal.

Let me say that my objections, and those of people who share my concerns, are fairly well-focused. First of all, we think No. 35 is based on what is fundamentally a faulty assumption about presidents and their activities within the NCAA. Almost implicit in No. 35 is the assumption that the presidents have not been effective in the past in the NCAA because some impediment existed there and we can sweep this aside now and create this new thing that will make their effectiveness possible. I simply do not believe that that is true.

This is not a popular message with my presidential colleagues, and I am as much involved and as guilty as any of them in what I am about to say. But the hard fact is that presidents have generally been neglectful of their interests in and concerns for the things that are dealt with in this body. They have not

only not attended over the years, they have not even bothered in many cases to instruct the very persons they have certified as delegates to this body. What that tells me very simply is that probably the most dramatic change that needs to be made, and one that will produce considerable effect, is the change in attitude and in actions of those of us who are presidents and who, in fact, do bear considerable responsibility for this matter.

Secondly, I believe that it not only is based on a false assumption, I really believe that it represents what to me is bad organizational policy. On its face, I just oppose the kind of concentration of power, extraordinary power, in the hands of a few people who might go off to the side and legislate its business and shift the burden back to what I would describe as the parent organization to do what they have chosen to do. I simply do not like that. I think a lot of people do not like that. I ask you to search your minds for what kind of national organization you are familiar with where any such mechanism exists. I know of none. I would say, as I have looked over the list of those that I belong to and participate in, I know of none that has both been able to restrain its enthusiasm for the adoption of this kind of thing for their own purposes. I think there is a good reason for that.

Thirdly, I am opposed to No. 35 because I think it is unnecessary. Any of you who were in San Diego last year, witnessed, I believe, a remarkable fact. You saw the passage of almost revolutionary legislation by NCAA standards out there. The reason you saw that, in my opinion, is that the presidents themselves got interested in, concerned about and actively supported a position; and the legislation resulted from that. I will tell you it did not require any particular change in the structure. What it did require was presidential interest and presidential action. I think that is the answer to this business. There is no need for me to say more. I will simply say that I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 35. It is obvious that it is potentially divisive. In my view, it is unnecessary and, beyond that, in some ways undesirable. I think that what we need to have done is for the presidents to assert themselves in a proper way and in a way that will accomplish what most of us agreed should be done. This can be accomplished through the adoption of Proposal No. 36.

Joseph M. Pettit (Georgia Institute of Technology): I would like to speak in favor of No. 35, but on a broader canvas than has been addressed by the speakers so far. I am basically speaking in favor of change. I say we need the NCAA and we need the full range of the agenda that it must address. And I speak only, instead, as to presidential involvement in the work of the NCAA.

There are three opportunities to vote for change on the agenda today. If we had only Proposal No. 39, I would vote for that. If we had Nos. 36 and 39, I would vote for No. 36 in preference. But we have No. 35, No. 36 and No. 39. I am voting for the most change. I think the question is, can we have a lesser legislative role in the NCAA? Can we do it better? I am sure that we can, and obviously we are not wrong.

I do want to say to those of you who have labored at these meetings and on committees that I had the pleasure of serving on the Division I Steering Committee, and I thought that was very worthwhile. You are not doing it wrong or inadequately, but I just think that we can do it better.

I see a need for a better legislative process in more respects than just presidential involvement. I see the presidential involvement perhaps being one part of a bicameral structure for legislation where presidents do have a unique role. They have authority on campuses, they have authority in

wielding a single paddle at this gathering, but they also have responsibilities that we carry on our campuses—that layer upon layer just added by this body right here. I think there is some incompatibility, perhaps, in certain issues.

Now, presidents are interested, because we do participate and at certain times under certain influences turn out for these meetings. We did in 1975 at a special meeting when financial improvements were being undertaken. We did last year in San Diego when academic improvements were being undertaken. It does indicate there are certain areas that have the highest interests, and there are certain opportunities when the time is right to participate. We do turn out then. But year in and year out, with the length of the agenda and the span of it, it does not auger well for presidential involvement. If you want to get more presidents involved, you need to do two things. You need to shorten the agenda and increase the voice or effectiveness in the participation. I think that Nos. 35 and 36 speak to that. No. 35 is better in that regard. I think of the town-meeting aspect that has been mentioned again and again, and the one institution-one vote principle. We are not a town any more, we are a good-sized city.

I think that we can exercise our votes through a legislative assembly that is elected democratically and let that body rule. Now, I think the presidential role is quite unique. I think No. 35 speaks most dramatically to it. It is not perfect. I had no part in the authorship of No. 35, No. 36 or No. 39. I am simply speaking as a president who has been necessarily involved. They are all imperfect, but not without potential for operation.

I think the unfortunate thing about No. 35 is the view that the only thing presidents are going to do is to sit back and wait and veto. I think what No. 35 provides is a necessity for advanced consultations to determine the president's position on legislation before he even comes in here. The Council could do better if it had that kind of leverage. I wish that it did, in fact.

Now, the imperfections are obvious in No. 35 and in No. 36, and for that matter in No. 39. And some of my colleagues have suggested that we send the whole mess back for reformulating in some way. I do not favor that. I think that would simply postpone action and we will all go back to sleep again. If we pass something today, it will move us farther along. So I advocate passing of No. 35; and again, if I were speaking again, I would advocate No. 36.

Mr. Scott: When these proposals are considered and a decision is reached, we will come to an implementation phase to put something in practice. I believe that the issue that will be raised boils down to an argument over veto power and one vote and whether the result represents good management. Under No. 36, and the accompanying resolution, the Commission can initiate bylaws legislation and get it before this body in an existing orderly manner. The Commission can specify that it be voted on by a roll-call vote. The membership in this body at this Convention can decide whether to adopt a proposal by a majority vote either by divisions or by the entire Convention, as the case may be. All of that will take place in an orderly, understood manner consistent with good management principles.

Under Proposal No. 35, we can have a situation, and I am going to cite some examples of it as I go through here, in which this Convention might adopt a proposal by a 60-percent vote or any other vote. If we use Division I as an example, that would mean approximately 180 institutions would have adopted a bylaw in that division. With the board created by No. 35, the

Division I members of that board could then veto, rescind or suspend the action. Whichever word you want to use, the result is the same.

In that action, as few as seven votes on the board could veto the decision of the 180 Division I members. An action thus approved by 180 members, 60 percent of the membership, could not be implemented until one year later and then only if the Division I membership would overturn the board's veto—not pass the legislation a year later, but overturn the veto by a majority vote. A tie vote would sustain the board. A majority vote would adopt the Presidential Commission's recommendation, and the difference between those two conditions can be one vote, as I said.

The difference seems to come down to an argument over veto power and one vote. It seems to me that a more fundamental question exists. Is moving to a system where a one-vote difference exists worth the sacrifice of granting to a small group such authority which, in fact, could be seriously disruptive to good management? Let me give you some examples.

The board in No. 35 can suspend an interpretation for up to one year, until the next Convention. An interpretation reached within current procedures by the Council, the Administrative Committee or others might render an outstanding football player ineligible; and the Board can suspend that interpretation for the entire season. I contend that the financial interests of the institution qualifies this issue for consideration by that board.

A second example: The sponsors of No. 35 have stated that football television can be within the purview of this board. The Council and other groups make necessary interpretations during the season. Those issues, I contend, can come under the financial authority of the board. One active supporter of No. 35 has stated before today that eligibility for the Division I men's basketball tournament would be an appropriate agenda item for the board. Another active supporter earlier today said the board is not qualified to do that, and thus we get into the ambiguity which I mentioned earlier. But if the board does have that jurisdiction, then decisions as to team eligibility and selection would be subject to appeal to and action by this. I would urge that we vote against No. 35 and support No. 36.

Daniel G. Aldrich Jr. (University of California, Irvine): I am delighted to join with my other chief executive colleagues in utilizing the mechanism this Association presently provides for our participation in its affairs. I wish to comment in opposition to Proposal No. 35.

I applaud the considerable efforts that my chief executive colleagues and the various officers have made to devise a mechanism that is intended to strengthen their participation and commitment to the Association in overseeing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. I would suggest, however, that such participation and commitment is better expressed in overseeing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics at home and in the instruction of their institutional representatives as they participate in the affairs of the Association. The chief executive officers should utilize the present machinery of the Association in giving direction to the conduct of intercollegiate athletics in this country as we did when we gathered in San Diego last year and as we are doing now in Dallas.

The creation of a representative board of CEOs would in effect provide an opportunity for an active minority of CEOs to determine the agenda of this Association. That is not, in my view, the way to ensure that the chief executive officers fulfill their responsibilities for the conduct of intercollegiate

athletics on their campuses and in the manner in which those campuses participate in the affairs of this Association. I would urge, therefore, a "no" vote on No. 35.

Hoke Smith (Towson State University): I am sure the emotions on this run very deep. I don't think it took more than five minutes for most of us while we were waiting for the bus to come in from the airport to find that out. I regret that. I think we are members of the NCAA and we are concerned about a common cause. That is how to create the best climate for intercollegiate athletics in this country.

Certainly, the NCAA has changed throughout the years; and we just have to look around this room to realize that, as one speaker said, we now live in a city and not a town. I admire the procedures and the scrupulous arrangements with which the NCAA conducts its meeting, but it is still a large forum for debate; and I think the length of debate over any issue as significant as this shows me there is an essential difference between Nos. 35 and 36.

Proposal No. 35 does create a Board of Presidents with limited authority on a representative democracy basis. CEOs are concerned about intercollegiate athletics. Unfortunately, we are also concerned about the status of teacher education, K-through-12 education, graduate education, the status of our research schools and student financial aid. That is in addition to the campus responsibilities of fund-raising and administration.

I think a representative forum which allows some CEOs to become involved for a limited period of time will permit us to spread the responsibilities we have for higher education, which include intercollegiate athletics but are not limited to intercollegiate athletics.

The other significant difference is that Proposal No. 35 establishes a representative democracy in which some CEOs elect others to represent them. Unfortunately, there have been periods in the development of No. 35 in which I think there have been a new acrimony and the arguments have been very emotional. As one of those who has been involved in this, we have tried to listen to what the spirit is of this Convention and the spirit is of the NCAA.

Therefore, we have moved from the original proposition of a two-thirds mail override to a two-thirds override by the Convention to a majority override by the Convention. It is true that in effect a group can delay the implementation of the will of this Convention for one year. Having been involved for two years in the organizational efforts to put through significant legislation, to me the chief advantage of this is not that it gives the CEOs power over this Convention, but in some instances it does shift the burden of organization from the CEOs to those who would oppose action from the Board of Presidents.

In effect, this is all it does. It can provide a focus for discussion. There are a number of objections that can be raised. It is true that there is no organization that can be created which is not subject to abuse and which cannot make an error, including a large meeting such as this. We have, however, admittedly left the powers general because there are many things that can affect both academic standards and financial stability.

At the same time, in paragraphs (j), (k), and (l), we have tried to provide limitations on the power of the Board of Presidents to limit any potential abuse and to provide in most cases adequate opportunity by the Council and other constituencies of the NCAA to comment before any action goes into

effect.

I would like to make one more comment about the role that we all find on our campuses, the one that we are familiar with whether we are CEOs or faculty representatives. Theoretically, on most campuses the president has the power to veto any action. A president who repeatedly does so is not very wise.

The existence of that power, of course, is a different kind of dialogue that is rarely used. The colleagues with whom I discussed this during the process of development believe the same thing. It is one thing that I think is missing, and this is my one comment about this particular kind of meeting that I think it is very unfortunate in the NCAA. Because there is so much emphasis on legislation and because there is so much emphasis on control and there is so much suspicion that people are trying to find ways around regulations, we are missing a positive voice for intercollegiate athletics.

That is not a criticism of the NCAA Council, its president or its leadership. It is simply the dynamics of this particular form of legislative meeting. I would hope the Board of Presidents could add its voice on behalf of the positive aspects of intercollegiate athletics and provide an access and opportunity for CEOs to be involved on a regular basis.

It is not, as has been pointed out, a perfect organization; but it is one which I believe does give room for significant involvement, does give democratic representation and at the same time preserves the impact of each paddle at this Convention in either voting yea or nay upon an action taken by the Board of Presidents. I ask your support of Proposal No. 35.

President Toner: It is one minute until the noon hour. If I will let you go one minute early, will you promise to be in your seats at 1:30 when we are supposed to reconvene? Thank you. We are in recess at this time.

[The Convention recessed at 11:59 a.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday Afternoon, January 10, 1984

The session convened at 1:30 p.m., with President John L. Toner presiding.

7. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Board of Presidents

E. Bruce Heilman (University of Richmond): During the recess, a number of individuals on both sides of Proposal No. 35 seemed to agree that about all that can be effectively said has been said; and, therefore, I want to defer the privilege of speaking and move the previous question.

President Toner: That certainly sounds as though it has been seconded. The motion of the previous question will call for a two-thirds vote to carry.

[The motion to cease debate on Proposal No. 35 as amended was approved.]

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I call for a roll-call vote on the motion before us.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Lattie Coor (University of Vermont): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for a reconsideration of that vote and in so doing note that many presidents have come here and many delegates have come here instructed by their presidents. We think in the spirit of fairness of one institution-one vote, and the democratic principles of this Convention, it would be wise to make sure that all of those principles are clearly recorded. I would like to ask for reconsideration of that vote just taken.

President Toner: President Coor, one question. I will have to ask you if you were on the prevailing side of this vote.

Mr. Coor: I was not.

President Toner: Then your motion is out of order. We are now ready to vote on No. 35, as amended.

[Proposal No. 35 (page A-27-38) was defeated as amended by Nos. 35-1 and 35-2, 313-328 (two-thirds majority required).]

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): Having voted on the prevailing side of the roll-call motion, I move for reconsideration on that issue. It seems to me that the chief executive officers of the member institutions of the NCAA are entitled to know unambiguously how their institutions voted. I think we have a moral obligation if we wish to preserve the integrity of this institution to call the roll.

[The motion was seconded and defeated, 283-353.]

NCAA Presidents' Commission

Arless L. Roaden (Tennessee Technological University): On behalf of the Council, I move approval of Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

Lattie Coor (University of Vermont): I wish to move adoption of Proposal No. 36-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment simply adds to the selection process of presidents to serve on the Presidents' Commission called for in No. 36. The process has a nominating committee composed of three representatives from the NCAA Council, who themselves are presidents, and from the five elected presidential associations. The actual election of 44 members will be by a mail ballot to every member president. I would urge this amendment as one that attests to the one institution-one vote, chief executive officer determination in the composition of the Commission called for in Proposal No. 36.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I would like to support No. 36-1. We have heard a lot over the last few days and prior to the Convention from individuals both for and against No. 36 and No. 36 that isn't there some way we can seek a reconciliation of the opposing view.

Many of the proponents of No. 35 objected to the Board of Presidents having the power to have sanctions, later changed to delays. The Convention acted on that. What we have before us now is an attempt to provide credibility for No. 36 in terms of how the presidents are chosen. As President Coor noted, this particular proposal would be that presidents are nominated by presidents who in turn have been selected by presidents in the five major presidential associations.

Also in this amendment, along with the provisions we make in No. 39, there is an attempt to get in some areas where it was feasible presidential selections at the lowest grass-roots level when it comes to the seven or so Division I-A playing conferences and the four Division I-AA regions.

The presidents in the football-playing conferences in I-A and I-AA regions would select those presidents who would serve on, if No. 36 is to be approved, what would be a Presidential Commission. That way, the conferences and the regions which are a recognized force in the NCAA structure would have representation by chief executives who have been picked by chief executives.

If you approve No. 36-1, it means that those slots would not be subject to nomination by a committee of presidents, no matter how honorable, which have been picked by the NCAA Council. What No. 36-1 would do is assure that presidential interests pick presidential interests. We think it provides credibility to the process, even though there are many fine people in the presidential group that has been picked by the NCAA. Indeed, under our proposal some of those by virtue of their national office would also be included in the proposal that results from No. 36-1 if you approve it.

I think we have a fatal problem here given the fact that a roll call was not taken on No. 35 if this Convention does not grant that presidents ought to have the right to select presidents. President Coor mentioned the mail ballot. In addition, under No. 36-1, the presidents legitimately picked would take office as soon as the election process by mail ballot occurred.

Under No. 36, without the amendment of No. 36-1, the presidents would be selected by presidents who were selected by the NCAA Council on which only five or six presidents serve; and while they might all be honorable people, the fact is they have not been selected by the presidents of the American colleges and universities, private and public. I think that would cast some doubt on the credibility, rightly or wrongly, of a commission that is so selected.

Under our Proposal No. 36-1, if passed by you, the fact is that once the ballots are taken, presidents legitimately will be elected at the grass roots, either by mail ballot of all chief executives or by those in I-A conferences and I-AA regions; whereas, under the NCAA proposal, if you are not in with the nominating committee, forget it, folks, you are not going to have a crack at it. You could get the show on the road much faster, much quicker, and perhaps try out No. 36, as amended, and see how it works. But if it is going to work, it must have some presidential credibility. I hope you will support No. 36-1.

Mr. Roaden: I would just like to make this explanation regarding the actions of the Council relative to the decisions about what mechanism ought to be used to get the first commission of presidents in place.

It was our belief that there ought to be a nominating committee of distinguished presidents and chancellors who would be charged with the responsibility of polling everyone in the country and coming up with that first Commission that could be started early without requiring another Convention or some kind of mail ballot.

Accordingly, the Council asked a group of 12 presidents if they would be willing to serve on the nominating committee to help get this first Commission in place. They have all agreed to do that. You have seen their names and pictures published in *The NCAA News*. They have been listed twice. These are honorable men and women.

They will be chaired by Chancellor Wesley Posvar of the University of Pittsburgh. I cannot imagine that they would not do an objective and thorough job of getting the first Commission in place. As has been pointed out, there is some overlap between this group and the group who would serve as proposed in the amendment.

My problem with the amendment is not the people who are there, it is just the problem of needing to go to Washington to get the former president and current president of five Washington-based organizations in order to come up with a Commission to work on behalf of the NCAA matters.

E. Bruce Heilman (University of Richmond): Mr. Chairman, I speak for No. 36-1. The presidents are little different, if at all, from others who feel they are represented best by those whom they personally select. The democratic process about which much has been said will be best served, I think, by approval of this amendment. Those who have favored No. 36 will have contributed to its successful implementation, if not its approval, by supporting this amendment. Further, I believe that you would help to consolidate forces in the elements of this body which are so important in carrying out its duties and responsibilities.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. President, as a member of the Select Committee which discussed this proposal on many occasions far sooner than this body ever considered it or any other body considered it, I speak in behalf of this amendment for several reasons; but primarily because I believe it most important that this Convention take a very positive step to ensure presidential involvement in the NCAA. Proposal No. 36 permits this, but we need to do this in such a manner that the vote by this Convention is almost if not unanimous to take this step at this particular time. On that question, I share with many of those that have expressed it on this floor that there is in the general body of this organization some concern with regard to the integrity of the way certain committees have been chosen in the NCAA, that they are sometimes self-perpetuating and chosen with little relationship to the interests of the membership.

While I do not share that view, I believe that this amendment would relieve any concern with regard to that view concerning the board of presidents chosen by this body. I, therefore, strongly urge this group to unanimously approve the amendment and to unanimously approve Proposal No. 36.

Very Rev. J. Donald Monan (Boston College): I am one of the presidents who would serve on both nominating committees since I agreed to serve on the NCAA committee if No. 36 was passed. As chairman of the National Association of Independent Colleges, I would have served on No. 35's nominating committee had it been passed. I would serve on No. 36, amended, on behalf of that national association.

I would strongly support the amendment simply because I believe that everyone would be much more comfortable with the selection process of the nominating committee and of the eventual members of the new committee. Therefore, I am strongly in favor of this amendment.

Paul Hardin (Drew University): I also speak in favor of the amendment, and I have a slightly different posture from the last speaker. I would have been on the nominating committee selected by the NCAA under No. 36. I will be on that unless this amendment is adopted. Therefore, if this amendment is adopted, I am probably out of a job. I do, nevertheless, support the amendment.

I think that the NCAA now ought to vote, and I like the motion of unanimity, to express some confidence in the presidential involvement in the deliberations through this advisory commission. I think it would be interpreted as almost a challenge or an affront to the presidents if we do not permit them the courtesy of electing their own representatives. I think this Convention does not want to appear to be in that posture. In fact, I am a little disappointed and a little surprised that the NCAA Council has not accepted this amendment. So the next best thing is someone who would have been on the NCAA nominating committee to ask you to vote me out of a job quickly.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment still reflects to a considerable degree one of the matters that concerned many of us who had worked hard on Proposal No. 36 and who have debated these issues over a period of some three or four months in committees and in discussions with representatives of the ACE group and others.

I have consistently been concerned that this particular aspect of the ACE plan represents to a considerable degree transferring the authority of other associations, some of which my institution is a member, into the NCAA. I think the Council has appointed a group of outstanding presidents, some of whom were asked to serve with the knowledge that they might not support No. 36. For those reasons and for the reasons advanced by President Roaden, I would urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): Mr. Chairman, I thought it was about time we got an intellectual up here. (Laughter.) I merely want to rise to support the amendment and I want to say that for someone who for many, many years has felt the presidents have not been involved either in individual institutions or in the NCAA to the extent they should be, I have been delighted by the attention that the presidents have given to the very meaningful problem we have had. Without their participation last year and certainly here today, we would not be where we are now, right on the threshold of becoming the best organization we probably have been in a long time. I want to thank the presidents for what they have done. Penn State voted against No. 35 for other

reasons which I will not say, but I think at this stage that we ought to make sure that the presidents continue their responsibility and continue to have the kind of input they feel is significant to their prestige and their responsibility.

I think it is very important that they feel this is a significant issue for them and that at this date we support them. We would hope that we could let the presidents who put so much time into making this a better organization know, as Roy Kramer said, that we appreciate their efforts by making a unanimous vote on behalf of this amendment.

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College (Iowa)): I am in a very peculiar position of having been involved in selecting the presidents for the NCAA panel and probably being asked to serve on the panel that is proposed in the amendment. I would like to comment clearly that I have great confidence in the quality of the proposed panel for the NCAA arrangement. But in view of the possibility for increased harmony and a way of moving this Convention and this Association ahead with enthusiasm and collaboration one with another, I would favor the amendment and would urge the delegates to so vote.

Edward Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): My chancellor, as you heard earlier, had agreed to serve as chairman of the nominating committee in the event that No. 36 was passed. He was not aware at that time of the amendment that is now before us; I have just got off the telephone with him, and he has asked me to offer to this group his willingness to have the University of Pittsburgh support the amendment to No. 36.

[Proposal No. 36-1 (pages A-46-48) was approved.]

Mr. Roaden: I believe what needs to have been said about Proposal No. 36 has been said. It is intended to be a collaborative and cooperative proposal with chief executive officers working hand-in-hand with their athletic directors and faculty representatives for the betterment of higher education and the betterment of intercollegiate athletics. I urge its passage.

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I had hoped to speak on No. 35, but I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 36. As a college president who has served on the NCAA Council as secretary-treasurer and president of this association and on committees too numerous to mention, I believe I qualify under the category of one who has been actively involved.

Nine years ago, I made the determination that intercollegiate athletics was important enough to my institution for me to get involved on a conference and national basis. I am not talking about an institution that has a million-dollar budget, but a budget that ranged from \$100,000 to \$200,000. As a result of this involvement during the past nine years, I have gained a few insights and have reached a few conclusions regarding presidential involvement.

I just want to take a few minutes to share with you some of my thoughts on the subject. I will not take the time to address the pros and cons of No. 35. I think we are past that point now. But I will take the time to address some of the statements which have been made at this Convention and during the past few months.

Oh, yes, I have heard about the price for greater presidential involvement. I have heard and read about the contention that college presidents are best qualified to deal with academic standards and to bring about financial stability. I know about the abuses that must be eliminated in intercollegiate athletics. All of these assertions and many more require further analysis. I have yet to hear a statement which argues that the NCAA Council has been incompetent or ineffective, or that the Executive Committee has been

ineffective, or that the committee structure is too cumbersome and unwieldy or that the entire structure of the NCAA needs to be revamped. I did prepare these remarks before the business session, and I do not think the remarks are true at this point because we heard remarks this morning which stated that the NCAA operation was described as an Alice in Wonderland operation.

It was described as a big mess. It does not take much imagination to interpret these remarks as a denigration of the tireless efforts of many dedicated individuals who have contributed mightily to this organization. It is a denigration of the competency and expertise which many individuals have brought to bear on assignments.

Along with other college presidents and athletic administrators I have pushed diligently and relentlessly during the past nine years for greater presidential involvement. This is a movement which is highly desirable. Many gains have been made. A cursory examination of the history of the NCAA reveals that I was the second or third institutional head to serve on the NCAA Council. For a number of years, I was the only one on the Council. Now, we have six presidents serving on the Council. I am reminded of the discussions that went into the planning of the chief executive officers' annual meeting that is now a reality. We had chief executive officers serving on the steering committees. The number of presidents coming to Conventions has increased drastically. I would be the first to acknowledge that much more needs to be done, but great strides forward have been made.

The assertion has been made that Proposal No. 36 is nothing more than a direct response to No. 35. This is simply not true. The NCAA has been dealing intensely with issues of governance during the last five years. A Special Committee on Governance, Organization and Services was appointed in 1979. The women's issue consumed two years of our time. Reorganization, television matters and other governance issues have been on the front burner for the past two years.

One specific charge to the Select Committee was to address the matter of governance and presidential involvement. Even if it was a direct response to Proposal No. 35, it showed the willingness of the organization to change, to change to meet the changing times.

Ladies and gentlemen, a board or a commission is not going to solve all of the problems that beset intercollegiate athletics. I have heard that the board will go a long way in solving the problems of the universities in lowering admissions standards for athletes. It will not solve the problem of indifference to whether the athletes graduate. It will not solve the problem of cheating in the recruitment process. We are dreaming if we believe that the board is a panacea. The problems are local, they are on a regional basis and they must be solved at the university and the college level.

I am disturbed by the statements that presidents do not have the time to devote to the matters that come before this Association. We have heard at Conventions about the associations in Washington, the American Council on Education, the Land-Grant Association, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. These associations are operated by presidents. The presidents do serve on those boards. Some of those boards meet as often as the NCAA Council and the Executive Committee. The time is devoted to operating those associations. The first question is why can't the same time be devoted to involvement in the National Collegiate Athletic Association? The structure is

here. This is an Association made up of institutions. You have heard it said over and over that the presidents do have the power and that is true. You can come here and raise your paddle or you can instruct your delegate how to vote on all of the issues. I really believe that if intercollegiate athletics are an integral part of higher education, then the time must be devoted by the presidents to dealing with these issues. We are dealing with budgets that are in excess of seven, eight, nine, 10 million dollars.

We have state legislators involved to some extent in your programs. To some extent, we have the Congressional delegation involved. I think with that kind of involvement it requires the time and effort of the college presidents.

In closing, I would just like to reiterate something that I said last year in my closing remarks to this Convention. In my view, the overriding issue and problem in intercollegiate athletics is not educational, not physical and not social, but is more moral than anything else. What should characterize all our theory and practice is what we do right for our students and fellow human beings. As college presidents, athletic directors, faculty representatives, athletic administrators and commissioners, we have it within our power to straighten out what is wrong in intercollegiate athletics. The Convention has voiced its will on Proposal No. 35. I believe that No. 36 provides for the meaningful involvement of presidents of the institutions that make up this Association.

I would urge your support of Proposal No. 36.

David E. Sweet (Rhode Island College): I have a marvelous and eloquent speech that I am not going to give, but instead I am going to move the previous question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 36 (pages A-42-46) was approved as amended by No. 36-1.]

Resolution: Roll-Call Vote

Arless L. Roaden (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of No. 36-2 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is offered as a resolution because an amendment would have been out of order. It is intended to make it possible for the Presidents' Commission to designate in the agenda in advance of its printing those items which the Commission believes ought to be subject to a roll-call vote.

[Proposal No. 36-2 (pages A-48-49) was approved.]

Division I Voting

Jack V. Doland (McNeese State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is from a Special Committee on Division I Criteria appointed by the Council. There were 12 of us appointed by the Council—presidents, faculty reps, women, Division I-Other, I-AA and I-A. It was passed, 10 to one, by the committee and was passed by the Council and the Division I Steering Committee.

Our charge on this committee was not to debate whether there is a problem with I-A autonomy. Our charge was to find a solution to the problem that was apparent to the Council. Many possibilities were considered. Among them was returning to Proposal No. 71 of 1983. Another one was adding basketball attendance requirements similar to football, such as 3,000 average

attendance at home and 100,000 home and away.

Potential Division IV financial considerations were considered, and finally we came to Proposal No. 37. Now, if you will read the dark print, you will find that this gives Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-Other the right to vote separately on any issues in the bylaws that may be amended by the divisions acting separately, with the exception of Bylaws 5-6 and 5-7, which relate to championships.

It also states that a bylaw provision adopted by I-A or I-Other may be rescinded by a two-thirds vote of the Division I members present and voting. Also, it says that only members of a division or subdivision may submit legislation that is to be applicable only to that division or subdivision in those bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately.

This was done even though it may fall short, and a lot of thought went into it. We feel it is in the best interest of the NCAA to give Division I the opportunity to meet together and to make suggestions or amendments to this group.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I rise to support Proposal No. 37, and I particularly wish to speak to my colleagues in Divisions II and III. In Houston in 1982, we, in Divisions II and III, appealed to the members of Division I to give us their support in our effort to change the five-year rule to the 10-semester rule. We needed their support because a two-thirds vote was required to provide us relief from the five-year rule.

We appealed to Division I on the basis of autonomy or the "federated principle," if you will, on the matter of eligibility. Our request of Division I was granted. They voted with us and gave us the autonomy we requested, and Divisions II and III now have their own eligibility rule. Consequently, I urge my colleagues in Divisions II and III to play fair, to reciprocate, to vote yes on No. 37 and give to Division I the kind of autonomy they granted to us in 1982.

Elizabeth A. Kruczek (Fitchburg State College): I would like to echo John's sentiments, inasmuch as No. 37 would foster the federated concept of the NCAA. Having had the opportunity to serve on the Council before the federated concept and now with the federated concept, we in Division III have found that it has greatly enhanced our programs and is certainly an aid in designing the destiny of Division III. I urge you to give this same courtesy to this subdivision.

William Larkin (St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania)): In response to the previous two speakers, I might point out there is a significant segment of Division I, namely that which has been categorized as Division I-Other, that would not necessarily agree that because of action taken in 1982, that it is a fair exchange to support these next two amendments. I would urge the members of Divisions II and III, as well as the members of Division I, to give serious consideration to the ramifications of giving a disproportionate amount of power to a segment of Division I and putting the Association in a situation whereby the members would have to override action by a two-thirds vote.

This, in my mind, reflects negatively on the democratic procedures we have given much attention to during the course of this Convention.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to serve on the Council this year; and I can comment to the Convention that the people on that body use the democratic process, and

they are dedicated people. Obviously, we do not agree at all times. My institution is categorized as I-Other. I think that the institutions in that category and those known as I-AA also had something to do perhaps with the support of Divisions II and III that we talked about previously.

It seems from my perception that at a time when we have just finished listening to a lot of talk about the presidents being involved and the fact that we need to heal wounds and all work together, Nos. 37 and 38 plan to divide us. I might mention that under this legislation, the members of Division I could be playing for a basketball championship and playing under different rules for financial aid, number of scholarships and many other areas. I might mention, too, that we have been talking here that things could be worked out among us in an open forum so we can hear each other's opinions and perspectives. Proposal No. 38 plans to have a separate meeting for Division I-A only. Any legislation passed there would have to be approved by the Convention, which means duplication of time and effort and expense.

I would like to quote from the Council's position: "Should basic legislative decisions binding upon all member institutions be decided in closed committee meetings?" A summer meeting of I-A is a closed committee meeting. The answer in the Council's own words: "No. Such binding decisions should be made only after the debate and decision in the open forum of the NCAA Convention."

I would like to suggest to you that we should remain one Convention at one time.

Hoke L. Smith (Towson State University): Last year I was in opposition to Proposal No. 71. I do regard this as one of the most serious questions facing this organization. Earlier, without much success, I may add, I advocated taking certain risks. I would again advocate that. I think this is a problem which must be addressed. The number of solutions that are available are limited, and after talking with a number of people throughout this year it appears to me that this is the best one. There are risks in it, but despite that I think it will help resolve one of the serious questions of this Association; I urge support of Proposal No. 37.

Victor A. Bubas (Sun Belt Conference): There are great concerns and serious reservations about Proposal No. 37. Yesterday, in the meeting of Division I-Other members—of which there are 89 members and additional allied members, totaling about 100 voting delegates—a straw vote revealed a unanimous vote against Proposal No. 37. A unanimous vote of that proportion must be examined and explained.

Why was the vote so overwhelming? Research has shown that fear is in the hearts of many of us that legislative autonomy in I-A will ultimately lead to more scholarships, bigger staffs, an increase in the average cost of an NCAA scholarship and, down the road but not immediately, a side-door restructuring of Division I and the effect of that on championship sports.

Yesterday at the round tables, we heard the proponents of Proposal No. 37 say it has not happened so far, and the likelihood is not great that it will happen in the future. To the chief executive officers who are here and who believe none of these things can happen if No. 37 passes, I hope you are right; but we think you should be concerned. We feel you should be concerned about more scholarships, bigger staffs, increases in the cost of average scholarships, potential life-threatening Division I criteria and a loss of automatic bids.

To the NCAA Select Committee that has drafted this legislation in the interest of autonomy in I-A but which has felt it would not lead to the results we think possible, I hope you are right. But we are concerned that you are not right. We appeal to Division I-AA to look at what can happen and what has happened in the past—the attempts to escalate costs and insert criteria which would disenfranchise your institutions and hurt your efforts to meet the competition.

We appeal to the institutions in Division I-A that have financial problems of their own, and that would be on the cutting edge of the results in their own division, to consider the possibilities that exist in this proposal. We are asking you to have the same compassion for us that you are asking us to have for you.

The NCAA Select Committee believes No. 37 cannot affect Division I basketball because it has drafted it that way for the present. But we think there is a crack in the door for many in I-A, those who do not like your decision to keep Division I criteria where it is and protect the automatic bids. If No. 37 passes, I feel sure we will be approaching the CEOs in the future who yesterday and today were told No. 37 would not hurt. We hope you are listening. We are concerned about our existence and our ability to exist in a reasonable way.

We are concerned about what will happen down the line. We want to continue to be a part of competition in Division I. We are bringing outstanding teams to many, many championship sports. We hope you value the competition we bring to Division I and will protect it. We think we have something to offer. We do not think that you have to play big-time football to be included in Division I activities.

A provision says that you need a two-thirds rescission of an action under this proposal, and I think that is rather dangerous. We urge you to take a long-range look at No. 37. The words we are concerned about are not in No. 37. They will be in what No. 37 produces. We urge you to defeat No. 37, and we also feel that there are related issues in Nos. 38, 43 and 49.

Roosevelt Wilson (Florida A&M University): I am concerned about Proposal Nos. 37 and 38, whether or not they are really in order. It is my understanding that I-A and I-AA referred to a subdivision of Division I for football only. I understand that there have been attempts to come up with another division. This Convention did not pass that legislation. I believe this proposal, as well as No. 38, is an attempt to camouflage; to deceive us, so to speak; to get some of the same concepts in that the Convention did not accept last year.

Division I-Other, I think, is simply a term of convenience to the Division I institutions that do not play football. So when we start talking about autonomy for I-A, the only thing we can accomplish are issues that concern the I-A football-playing institutions. There is no such division as I-A or I-AA. These are subdivisions. With that in mind, I think what we are doing here is trying to create a division from a subdivision. I think we need to take a careful look at that. I think if we want to come up with another division, let's call a spade a spade and go back to the drawing board and come up with the proposal that will create another division. For that reason, I say let us defeat No. 37, No. 38, and those other issues and go back and be honest and open with each other.

Frederick S. Humphries (Tennessee State University): Most of what I

have to say has been said by the commissioner of the Sun Belt Conference. I simply want to make it clear there is opposition in Division I-AA to No. 37. We already have in this organization a lack of a proportionate representation on the Council coming from Division I-AA and from the basketball-playing schools. We have made a great deal in terms of the legislation that we perpetuate. In the NCAA, we are taught to have equity in competition in the sports we participate in. This is a further erosion of that equity.

I believe that in the interest of the NCAA we should continue to operate as a Division I and not split us out. In the spirit of what has been passed for having a unified organization, I would urge upon the membership of Divisions II and III and all the members of Division I AA not to support Nos. 37 and 38.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): Yesterday at one of the round tables, President Pettit from Georgia Tech focused in on our problems at this particular Convention. He said we have been concerned with "federalism" and he challenged the sponsors of Nos. 35 and 36 as to how they viewed the bigger picture in the future. He also said we should see or judge whether tomorrow—today being tomorrow—we would be participating in a 20th-century forum.

Now, I think there are two things that have been prevalent as far as my interest in the NCAA, maybe three in the sense of academic standards. One has to be to get some autonomy for Division I-A schools. I think it is unrealistic for people to ask us to continually go along and make compromises and adjustments and do things we do not in conscience believe are right for our particular programs. I have gone through this with the College Football Association. When the CFA was put together, everybody was afraid that it was going to be one great big conference and we were going to come out with all kinds of numbers as far as grants, coaching staffs and what have you. As we have proven, particularly the coaches in the CFA, we have been responsive to academic standards and to financial restrictions.

I would hope that the people in this Convention would understand that the people in I-A want to do the job for the people that we service. Sometimes I think we get together here and get to playing politics—who is going to howl, who is going to do what. I am concerned with the athletes that we have to handle. I think we need some kind of autonomy to do a better job with the athletes.

I would not rise and be so strong for Proposal No. 37 if we did not have either No. 35 or No. 36. I would be uncomfortable with 104 schools having that kind of autonomy and power if we did not have the kind of presidential veto power, however you want to put it, to control those 104 schools. In addition to that presidential control, the two-thirds vote would overturn what might be done by I-A by itself.

I really believe we need some autonomy. I do not care how you twist it or turn it, it is very difficult to sit down and pass legislation when you realize that you have to compromise all the time in order to get enough votes to get it done. Many of us have been in this position. We are right now on the verge of having the kind of "federalism" and presidential control we want, and the interest in how we are going to do things academically and in our financial stability. I hope we would not have gone this far and backed away from probably the single-most important item, as far as I am concerned even more important than Nos. 35 or 36. Because without I-A autonomy, as was quoted

this morning by the president of Boston College, we still have those forces which are pulling us apart. If we pass this, we slice those forces tremendously; and I think it would be a great thing to get this organization closer together. I would urge all of you to vote for No. 37.

Andrew T. Mooradian (University of New Hampshire): The NCAA over the years has tried to meet the needs of the membership in by establishing Divisions I, II and III, and later by subdividing Division I to I-A and I-AA. Division I-A has never run wild with scholarships or assistant coaches because they had the autonomy.

Last year, Proposal No. 71 brought out some interesting problems which No. 37 tries to answer. One, having schools remain in Division I. I think that Proposal No. 37 does that since the complete program at all schools remains in Division I. People have objected to criteria for Division I. Proposal No. 37 has no criteria for Division I. Then there is automatic qualification to the basketball tournament. Although Proposal No. 37 does not speak to that, that has been answered by the basketball tournament committee, recommending to the Executive Committee that the basketball tournament in 1985 be expanded from the present number to 64. This will allow all present conferences in Division I to retain their automatic qualification. As to Division I voting on its own problems, I think that at this time Division I has to have its own meeting; and I do not look at that as a threat. I look at it as a meeting where they can sit down, talk over their problems and come up with legislation.

We have listened to Nos. 35 and 36. The presidents of the I-A schools are deeply concerned with academic affairs and financial affairs. I also believe passage of No. 37 will get more presidents involved if they will be able to rule their own destiny in Divisions I-A, I-AA, I-Other, and II and III.

Mr. Doland: Most of the statements made by Mr. Mooradian are very strong in our minds in I-AA. We urge your support of this. We also heard all of the I-Other representatives who would not admit the criteria of Proposal No. 71 last year to give very serious consideration to supporting I-A autonomy. We feel, as Andy Mooradian just stated, that this is good for the Association.

McNeese State University was I-A and has been in I-AA football now for four years. It still meets the attendance criterion. There have been no problems with Division I-A ever making a rule that would harm I-AA in the past four years. They have not increased coaches, they have decreased coaches. They have not increased scholarships; there have been more moves to decrease scholarships than increase them. They were delighted to meet with their like universities and make the decisions that they think are necessary. If it is a decision that is bad for I-AA and I-Other, certainly some of the I-A schools would join with us in rescinding it. I see no problem with this, and I urge the I-Other schools who did not meet Proposal No. 71 criteria last year to give serious thoughts to supporting this matter.

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): I would like not to have us leave here today thinking that whatever happens in Division I or I-A does not affect the rest of us. The same way that when somebody builds a steel mill it pollutes the air, it does not affect the rest of us. Whatever we do affects the rest of us.

Any legislation they might pass, although it will be to their benefit, will certainly have an effect upon the rest of us. I just want us all to look at that

and say we would like for you to go your own way, we would like for you to have as much rule as you possibly can have when we leave here but whatever is done in one college has a spill-out effect.

If you give more scholarships, if you increase the pay for your officials, whatever you do affects the rest of us. I would like for you to think that that is part of this world. You cannot escape from it. So Division I-A, go your own way; but do not come up to the microphone and say that nothing you do affects us. We want you to have your way but it affects everybody.

Mr. Kaiser: I just would like to answer a few of the remarks that were made by the previous speakers. No. 1, I would like to say to Joe Paterno, that anybody in this room who is married knows that you have to make compromises and adjustments. I think that carries over to every group, however small or large. I think that is part of the process. I have asked the Council, an outside Council to members of the Division I-A group, what do you want that cannot be gotten under the present circumstances? I have not gotten any specific answers.

I would like to say to President Doland that the analogy he made between I-A football and I-AA football is not exactly equal to two groups of Division I basketball institutions perhaps under different rules in the same championships. I think I would also like to say to President Doland and to the other speakers that I feel that our institutions, not only Division I-A institutions and their presidents, certainly are just as interested in financial and academic affairs.

For the last few years there has been legislation for Division IV that has been defeated. Some people have remarked that if this legislation is not passed we will see Division IV. It is my opinion that you are seeing it right now under Nos. 37 and 38. It just has a different label.

Mr. Paterno: Since my opponent back at Brooklyn, Jack Kaiser, has mentioned the fact that in marriages there have to be compromises, I would like to know, is the husband I-A and the wife I-Other? Because in my marriage, if the husband is I-A, I have given up a hell of a lot more compromises than the other side. I think it has to be a two-way street, John. I think we are aware of that.

I would hope that my good friend from Le Moyne College, another good Jesuit school up there, would understand and that all of us understand that we have a responsibility to every single institution in this room as you have a responsibility to the Division I-A schools.

I would hope that you would have enough trust in us. I hope you would have enough trust in our understanding of the kinds of compromises that have to be made. But there is a point where compromise defeats any constructive effort. I think at that point I-A has to have some freedom.

E. M. Jones (Grambling State University): I made the statement yesterday that in Wilson's League of Nations he stipulated there can never be a peace among unequals. I reiterate that. If we want to use the analogy of the family, of the husband and the wife, that is perfectly applicable here. But we all realize, if I may use another analogy of the family, that mothers and fathers do what they want to do and acquiesce when they want to with their children. So do husbands with their wives. But we all know who is the head of the household. So, then, when a person makes a concession, he does so because he knows that he has the prerogative of making that concession. He is not going to do anything which is going to hurt him in the long run. (Laughter.)

[Proposal No. 37 (pages A-49-50) was defeated. Part A was defeated by Divisions I (129-170) and II (50-93) and approved by Division III. Approval by all divisions was required. The proposal later was reconsidered by Divisions I and II, and Part A again was defeated by Division I (129-140). See discussion following reconsideration of No. 38.]

Division I-A Meeting

Rev. Edmund P. Joyce (University of Notre Dame): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

In presenting this proposal, I speak as a member of the NCAA Select Committee on Athletic Problems and Concerns in Higher Education. In its deliberation over a period of some 19 months, the committee was aware that one of the most important challenges still confronting the NCAA was a refinement of the division reorganization within the NCAA which began in 1974 and has continued down to the present day. The underlying rationale for reorganization has been the conviction that schools with similar problems, philosophies and commitments, particularly in the sports of football and basketball, should be given more control over their own policies and practices. Division II and Division III are apparently happy with their independence. Problems, however, continue to exist in Division I where schools with quite different programs have a very restless coexistence.

Progress, of course, was made in this division when the subdivisions in football were created and we came up with Divisions I-A and I-AA. While Division I-AA was at first concerned about its new status, I understand that these schools are now content with their independence. Remaining in Division I are a large number of universities and colleges without football teams but with major commitments to the sport of basketball. At last year's Convention, the NCAA Council sponsored a proposal which would have removed a number of these colleges from Division I based on certain criteria requirements. This proposal failed to carry a year ago. Now, the Select Committee did not involve itself in any recommendation for the strictly basketball institutions. Thus, Proposal No. 38 deals solely with Division I-A.

Because the sport of football looms so large in the entire athletic programs of the Division I-A schools and because the NCAA Convention does not lend itself to a thorough discussion of important and complicated football issues, the Select Committee has come up with a strong recommendation in the form of Proposal No. 38. This proposal provides for a special Convention in June each year for the I-A schools which would deal exclusively with football matters and during which they could pass for themselves binding legislation affecting those exclusive football matters. One of the purposes of a convention of this sort, in addition to providing ample time for serious debate, is to enable the football coaches to be party to these discussions so that they feel that they also, whose lives and careers are so tied in with this particular sport, can be in partnership with the rest of us in making plans for the sport of football.

We also feel by giving the coaches an input into these deliberations we help to strengthen the policy of self-policing among that professional group. An important note to point out to you, which is contained in Proposal No. 38, is this does not give total autonomy by any means. It provides a limitation on

that autonomy by stating that whatever legislation is passed in June does not go into effect until the following January Convention, at which time the Convention itself will have the opportunity to rescind anything that was passed in June if they feel it is going to be detrimental or harmful to their own interests.

It is not complete autonomy by any means. I am happy to say that the NCAA Council has endorsed this proposal and the Select Committee urges its adoption.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): Am I correct that if this summer meeting were approved the only pieces of legislation that could be considered would be those involving I-A football?

Fr. Joyce: The answer is yes.

President Toner: Fr. Joyce, you made mention the summer meeting would be a special Convention. I think you meant a special meeting, did you not?

Fr. Joyce: Yes, a special meeting.

President Toner: I would like to have that recorded in the record that way.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): I am confused just like Jack Kaiser was. There is no mention of the actions to football whatsoever in the proposal itself. Should it not be amended?

President Toner: I think, Frank, that the only thing that I-A may do now is to act on matters particular to football, and that situation does not change if No. 38 is passed.

[Proposal No. 38 (pages A-50-51) was defeated, 339-235 (two-thirds majority required). The proposal later was reconsidered and approved. See discussion following Council Recognition.]

NCAA Council

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College (Iowa)): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 39 is the final item in our major attempts to sustain and strengthen the involvement of CEOs in the governance of the Association. In striking contrast with the other proposals that have been presented, occupied our time and strained our emotions today, this is simple, straightforward and nonpolitical. It requires each steering committee in the Council to include chief executive officers.

There are three clarifying points. First, the effective date of the proposal follows the conclusion of this Convention and, therefore, does not affect this year's election. Second, the two chief executive officers from Division I would probably come from those nominated by the Nominating Committee; and it is hoped that the appointments by I-A conferences would include two more. Third, membership on the Commission of Presidents would not preclude membership on the Council. In fact, this arrangement would add a decided strength to the collaborative process. Establishment of the Commission lends special urgency to this proposal. Effective liaison between the Council and the Commission will strengthen each group and enhance the effectiveness of their work together. The apparent strength of the new structure is the merging of significantly different skills and professions.

This proposal has several strengths. First, it builds on the strength of the existing structure. Second, it facilitates the implementation of the new. It increases the presidential involvement on the basis of knowledge as well as

power, and fourth, we know that it works. I urge the delegates to support it. [Proposal No. 39 (page A-52) was approved.]

NCAA Council

Twyman Jones (Illinois State University): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation would provide NCAA Council representation for those Division I conferences which sponsor only women's sports. There are at this time 59 member institutions of Division I affiliated with these conferences, and these 59 institutions represent 20 percent of the NCAA Division I membership. Designating one seat from the current at-large positions would give this constituency about 4½ percent of the Council representation without affecting Council representation for Divisions I-A, I-AA or I-Other designations that are now guaranteed.

Since at the present time there appears to be an increasing number of Division I member institutions choosing to place their men's and women's programs in separate conferences, there is a growing need to ensure that both programs are represented equitably on the Council. I, therefore, urge your support for this proposal.

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I want to speak in opposition to this proposal. I think the record of my position on the involvement of women in the NCAA is clear. I want to call your attention to a provision in the governance plan that was passed in 1981, which made provision for women to be represented on the Council, the Executive Committee and all committees of the NCAA. This provision is in place. In that legislation there was also the statement that the appointing authority would always give consideration to the appointment of minorities and Blacks on these committees. I do not feel that the minority representation is still what it should be. We do have women represented on all the committees of the NCAA. For that reason, I would oppose this legislation.

Mr. Jones: I have a point of clarification. We are not requesting that this appointment be to a woman. It is not to get representation for the women on committees. It could be a man, it could be any minority person; it could be a woman. But it is not as much to get women representation there as far as it is for the women's programs to be represented.

[Proposal No. 40 (page A-52) was defeated, 321-246 (two-thirds majority required).]

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-53) was moot due to the approval of No. 36-C and D.]

Resolution: Women's Meeting

David B. Smoyer (Swarthmore College): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal calls for the convening of a meeting of primary woman athletics administrators prior to July 1, 1984. This would be a one-time meeting to consider developing legislation for presentation to the 1985 NCAA Convention. The 1985 Convention will be the last opportunity for delegates to consider proposals for legislation concerning women's athletics

before the NCAA rules become mandatory for women's athletics in August 1985.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): In the pre-Convention review of proposed legislation, the Council asked for reaction from the women's round table to Proposal No. 42. At the well-attended women's round table, concern was expressed on the 1985 implementation of NCAA rules in women's programs not currently following NCAA regulations and the implementation of such legislation. The round table strongly supported the need for a meeting prior to July 1 to address the concerns in women's athletics and prepare for 1985. This message was carried back to the Council, which unanimously agreed to support Proposal No. 42. I urge the membership to support this proposal.

Eve Atkinson (Hofstra University): Also on behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee on Women's Interests, I urge you to support Proposal No. 42. As my former colleague on the Council and on the women's committee has indicated, there was a strong voice in the women's round table to support this proposal.

I would like to remind the Convention that the intent of this resolution is not to create an annual meeting of this nature. It is the intent of the sponsors of this resolution, the NCAA Council and the NCAA Special Committee on Women's Interests, to unite NCAA primary woman athletics administrators in one meeting with the NCAA Special Committee on Women's Interests and to, we hope, resolve problems and issues of major concern to women's sports programs. As a member of and on behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Special Committee on Women's Issues, I urge your support of Proposal No. 42.

[Proposal No. 42 (pages A-53-54) was approved.]

Allied Conference Voting

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

When the Council sponsored this proposal at last year's Convention, it was approved by 55.43 percent of the voters but not by the two-thirds required. The Council is sponsoring it again because it believes that it is very important to affirm the Association's guiding principle that it is an organization of institutions and that no institution's vote should carry any greater weight than any other institution's vote.

The conference-vote privilege creates an imbalance in the NCAA voting structure. It is possible for an institution currently to have its position represented by as many as four different votes. That would be in a case where an institution has an institutional vote, another as a member of the conference for men, another as a member of a different conference for women and perhaps as a fourth as a member of an umbrella organization such as the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

That results in an inequity because an institution belonging to just one conference for both men's and women's programs loses representation. It also disadvantages independent institutions who have only their single institutional vote. This proposal in no way denigrates the important role of conferences in the NCAA. The summary urges that the allied voting privilege be abandoned to assure that each institution's vote is the same value as that

of any other institution. The Council urges your support of the one institution-one vote principle.

[Proposal No. 43 (page A-54) was defeated, 349-223 (two-thirds majority required).]

Conflicts of Interest

Charles H. Samson (Texas A&M University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of the proposal is to prohibit NCAA committee members from participating in discussion and vote on any committee action from which the members may directly or indirectly derive any financial benefit. Not only would this proposal place in our legislation logical practice, but it also would be in accord with the advice of the NCAA legal counsel.

[Proposal No. 44 (page A-55) was approved by all divisions.]

Sports Committees

Eugene F. Corrigan (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this is pretty obvious—to specify that not less than 25 percent of the positions on each sports committee be filled by athletics administrators. I think it is important to look at the effective date. While it says immediately, it also says that no individual serving on a committee shall be expected to serve a shorter period of time than customary service on that committee would dictate. In such cases, the membership shall be adjusted as vacancies occur. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 45 (pages A-55-56) was approved by all divisions.]

Volunteers for Youth Committee

Charley Scott (Mississippi State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

To me, a responsible citizen in the community has a duty and obligation to have a program of support of charity. I consider the NCAA to be a responsible citizen. Investment in the Volunteers for Youth program is a support of charity. Interested student-athletes work with younger people in the community in a "big brother" type of association. The members of the Executive Committee have believed in this activity for five years and have provided \$143,000 to that activity in each of those years.

The program has proven to be worthwhile and important. It is an important aspect in the lives of the college students who participate in it, and the Council members believe that the committee should be established as a regularly established committee with appointments made in the same manner as with other Council-appointed committees.

[Proposal No. 46 (page A-56) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 47 (page A-56) was withdrawn.]

Football Television Committee

Elmer W. Yoest (Otterbein College): On behalf of the Council and the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal deletes the requirement that a Division III member of the Football Television Committee be a current or former member of that division's Football Committee. The Division III Steering Committee encourages the adoption of Proposal No. 48 in order to provide additional opportunity for individuals to serve on the Football Television Committee. Under the present bylaw, only individuals that have served previously on a Division III Football Committee would be eligible to serve on the television committee. That rule has been very restrictive. The change would provide greater flexibility to the appointment of individuals with interest and experience in football who have not previously served on the Division III Football Committee. Since 1953, only six individuals in Division III have been eligible to serve. I urge the adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 48 (pages A-56-57) was approved by all divisions.]

Financial Aid Limitation

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I rise to move adoption of No. 49 on behalf of the Select Committee on Athletic Concerns and Problems in Intercollegiate Athletics.

[The motion was seconded.]

After almost a year or more of a very detailed study of the NCAA Manual, one of the more controversial subjects among athletic directors across this country, and many recommendations to simplify that Manual and take steps to make it more readable and perhaps more meaningful to all of us who must apply it on a daily basis, there was a considerable amount of consideration of all of the areas provided in that Manual to include eligibility, recruiting, squad limitations, limitations on financial aid awards, NCAA championships, extra events and financial aid.

The one major incongruity in the orderly move toward division autonomy with regard to each of these areas and the standards required for each was found to be the definition of "commonly accepted educational expenses," the standards for financial aid. Therefore, the Select Committee unanimously proposes that this proposal be submitted to the Convention in order that the definition be moved from the constitution to the bylaws so that it may be voted on by the divisions at the Convention, thereby providing division autonomy.

By supporting Proposal No. 49, this Convention would take the last major step toward making the necessary adjustment in the NCAA Manual which will permit division autonomy in the area of financial aid—a concept almost unanimously supported by this membership in every other area of the Manual.

[Proposal No. 49 (pages A-57-58) was defeated, 384-185 (two-thirds majority required).]

Financial Aid—Pell Grants

Robert C. James (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

This matter was referred to the Recruiting Committee to study and was given very serious consideration. We presented it to the football and basketball coaches' meetings this summer, and they strongly endorsed it. It

has no regard whatsoever to the young man's athletic ability, and I strongly urge you to pass it.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): We have two chances, at least, not to have anything to directly affect the athletes that we are involved with. The Federal government does not ask the athlete whether he is on any kind of scholarship when it makes this Pell Grant Award. What we all do, as we all know, is to take the athlete's money and pay it back for his or her scholarship. In a sense, we subsidize the athletes through the money they have already earned. There is no recruiting advantage by the use of Federal grants. Nobody has made any charges that anyone has a pipeline to Washington to make sure that our athletes can receive these grants. The disadvantage is that the needy students are really disadvantaged by the way we operate by taking the Federal money and reducing the scholarship.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): This proposal was unanimously endorsed by the Select Committee as a strong and viable method to address some of the problems we have with some of our students from disadvantaged backgrounds who have major economic problems when they arrive on our campuses. We feel this is a positive step in the right direction to alleviate this problem, and we would urge the Convention to support it.

[Proposal No. 50 (page A-58) was defeated, 374-226 (two-thirds majority required). NOTE: This proposal later was reconsidered and approved. See discussion following the reconsiderations of Proposal Nos. 37 and 38.]

Financial Aid—Summer School

Gilbert S. Banker (Purdue University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is to give incoming student-athletes a head start on their academic programs by permitting such incoming student-athletes the opportunity to receive financial aid during the summer prior to the student's freshman year. The goal of the proposal is to provide students with a better chance for academic success, in the revenue sports in particular.

The dollar cost of the program would not be great and should be cost-effective. This would be so if even a relatively small percentage of students who participate in the program become academically successful when they might not otherwise.

Some of the questions that have been raised regarding the proposal include the meaning of minimum full-time academic load. It is the definition of your institution. For example, how you define minimum load for full fees. Another question is, could a student become academically ineligible based on performance in summer school? The answer to that is no. There are no quantitative requirements for summer school by NCAA rules. Of course, the grades received in that summer school would be included in computations for indices for eligibility in subsequent semesters and terms.

Some have suggested that the word "unconditionally" in Line No. 2 that applies to the status of admissions be omitted. Some institutions could provide conditional admission of students in that summer term prior to the freshman year. However, the NCAA does permit conditional admission or special-orientation admissions as noted in Constitution 4-(b)-(1).

It has been argued in the past that the intent of this proposal would be

contravened by our football coaches who would simply use such an amendment as a means of starting football practice early for the incoming freshmen. In addition to being prohibited under the rules, I give our football coaches more credit than that. The proposal does have an honorable intent. It has been before us before, it is academically sound and it has the interest of those athletes in mind who might most greatly benefit by the opportunity the proposal would provide. We, therefore, urge your support of this proposal for the many athletes now and in the future who would be advantaged by it.

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): This particular legislation reached this forum two years ago when it responded to a need for some permissive legislation to allow the very effective summer grade program to permit marginal students to come in and achieve at a very much higher rate than they would achieve without the summer bridge program. It has been effective for these last two years—a conditional admission—this language in O.I. 2 specifically states that conditional admissions will not be allowed. I seek an answer to the question on that particular item before we vote on it.

President Toner: Would the sponsor care to define conditional for us?

Mr. Banker: The Berkeley Rich program, I believe, is for nonathletic aid and would be permitted as specified.

Theodore A. Bick (Union College (New York)): I also have a question. Suppose a student receives credit for one or more courses taken during the summer. May that student then take a reduced load during some season and still be regarded as making normal progress toward a degree?

Mr. Banker: The student, I understand, would still be required to take 12 credits each regular semester.

John C. Parry (Brown University): I also have a couple of questions. Will this be considered so that Section D will be a separate vote? Section D refers to whether or not one of these students-athletes transfers. Will it be a separate vote on this section?

President Toner: Proposal No. 51 will be voted on with Parts A and B together and Parts C and D together. Parts C and D will be moot if A and B fails.

Mr. Parry: I would respectfully request that Parts C and D be split. And I have one question on Part D. Is a recruited athlete who is not receiving financial assistance subject to the transfer rule?

Mr. Banker: It would not affect that. It would follow the current rule.

[Proposal No. 51 (pages A-58-59) was defeated.]

Financial Aid—Board and Room

Wilford S. Bailey (Auburn University): On behalf of the Council, I move approval of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

There are two reasons for offering this proposal. The primary reason is related to equity between institutions and equivalency awards. Under current rules, an institution can use an equivalency calculation—a high value for room and board for student-athletes living off campus—even though the students do not actually receive room and board in those high-cost facilities. The effect of using this inflated value based on the average cost of student-athletes living on campus, including those in athletic dorms and eating at the training table, is to permit a distortion of the equivalency

limitations.

Specifically, a larger number of students could receive tuition grants without exceeding the numerical limitations. A hypothetical example will illustrate this. If one assumes that an average cost per student-athlete living on campus is \$3,000, the average cost of students, excluding those in athletic dorms, is \$2,000, and tuition fees are \$2,000, then under the current rule the maximum total grant is \$5,000. If the student receives tuition, it is a 40-percent grant and would permit 25 athletes with a 10-grant limitation in a sport.

Under the amendment, the maximum total is \$4,000, the student receives tuition and it is a 50-percent grant and would thus limit it to 20 athletes in the 10-sport award. It obviously would provide for equity between institutions if the proposal is approved.

A point of interest to institutions with athletic dorms and training tables is that the proposal can reduce somewhat the cost for the athletic department of housing and meals for student-athletes living off campus. The proposal at the same time provides aid to student-athletes consistent with aid to students generally.

In the interest of achieving equity for the equivalency awards, we urge support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 52 (pages A-59-60) was approved.]

Financial Aid—Undergraduate Student-Athletes

Fred Hemke (Northwestern University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is my understanding that many conferences were permitting five years' aid for five or six years in the past. This practice was necessarily concluded, however, when an NCAA interpretation spelled out Constitution 3 to mean five years' aid in five years' time. The intent of this amendment is straightforward: to permit more student-athletes the opportunity to obtain this baccalaureate degree.

The amount of financial aid currently allowed during the five-year period will not be exceeded by this amendment. What will change, however, is the time frame in which this aid may be awarded. The amendment will allow the current five years of aid to be awarded within six years of initial enrollment.

By way of example, many fifth-year student-athletes who have not completed their degrees leave school after the fall term to try their hand at tryouts for professional teams. This amendment will provide an incentive for student-athletes and others who are not accepted by professional teams and recognize that their degree really is important to them. By providing a sixth year without modifying present financial aid stipulations, student-athletes will have a fair opportunity to earn their degrees. I urge the adoption of No. 53.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): It is still not clear, despite careful explanation, what the problem is that is being solved by this proposal. We are, I think, all committed to the proposition that we want to promote as much as possible the academic achievements of our student-athletes.

There are not very many people who are getting grants beyond six years. There are a very few. To the extent that we can promote some additional

academic progress by people who come back late to finish up, it seems to me we ought to be for that. Our academic progress rules, we hope, will push them along to more academic progress in a faster period of time. I do not think we can count on the proposition that will cover everybody.

The current rule, as we understand it, does not really give anybody an advantage because they happen to aid some people late. This is not the kind of thing that I think creates any competitive disadvantage to anybody. It really goes unnoticed. There are very few people aided in this fashion. We would like to continue to have the opportunity to aid a few late bloomers.

[Proposal No. 53 (page A-60) was defeated.]

Financial Aid—Established Awards

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of Proposal No. 54 is perhaps best illustrated by referring to tactical events over the past two years. Every fall, we discover a few students who have come to the university and turned out for participation in some sport. After getting information from them, we find out that they have received a \$250 award from some high school booster club or from some golf association that has recognized their golf athletic ability, or it could be for some other recognition because of achievement in high school.

Under our present rules, we must declare that student ineligible for athletic competition because athletic eligibility has been a major criterion in the making of this outside award. The purpose of this proposal is to add to our constitution another form of award that can be accepted by a student and not affect his athletic eligibility. I urge the Convention to give this careful consideration.

I have personally found it very difficult to explain to students and parents why the NCAA rules prohibit the acceptance of an award given in good faith by some high school booster club. The legislation has been drafted so as to put a restriction on the amount; it also makes it clear that this can be awarded only once, and it makes it clear that a university or college group cannot be the sponsor of an award such as that described in the proposed legislation. I urge favorable consideration.

[Proposal No. 54 (pages A-60-61) was defeated.]

Income From Officiating

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

This comes to you as a recommendation from the newly constituted committee on improving officiating. Our committee studied long and hard ways to increase the interests of young people of quality in officiating. The committee came up with the idea that maybe it would be appropriate for young people in our colleges to have the opportunity to get interested in officiating by officiating intramural sports.

Intramural sports programs pay their officials, and student-athletes from all sports would have a difficult time with this if they were on financial aid. We urge you to consider this and vote favorably on it.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): On behalf of the Council, I

want to express opposition to this. This is a chink in the armor that has been carefully preserved by the Convention over many years, as late as today, in not allowing compensation over and above the full grant-in-aid. This is something which may have some benefit, but there are many other things which have benefit such as perhaps coaching part-time in a local high school or working in a local store in addition to being able to get a full grant-in-aid. There are many things that one could come up with. We do not feel there is anything so special about this one which requires that this be allowed. Also, it is obvious that this is something that could be abused horribly and easily.

Mr. Lude: The committee wrestled with that, and we felt that there were enough people of integrity in our universities administering intramural programs that could keep the time cards perfectly legal and honest and not look for chinks in armor. I would hope we have people administering the programs who are honest, not dishonest.

[Proposal No. 55 (page A-61) was defeated.]

Financial Aid—Summer School

David L. Maggard (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

This summer during the 1984 Olympic Games, there will be institutions in which programs and facilities will either be available for very restrictive use or not at all because these facilities will be utilized for Olympic preparation or competition. This legislation will allow those institutions which are restricted in this regard to have a one-time exception through Council approval to provide financial aid for continuing student-athletes to attend summer school at another institution. We ask your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 56 (pages A-61-62) was approved.]

Maximum Awards—Equivalencies

Robert W. Sankey (University of Arizona): I move adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 57 is intended to eliminate some of the current restrictions and inequities that occur by including in financial aid for equivalency sports aid which is not athletically related. This proposal would restrict the aid that needs to be counted in equivalency sports to that aid which, as the legislation indicates, is based in any degree upon athletic ability.

The legislation, I think, has two advantages. First, it should allow broader distribution in many cases of athletically related aid to student-athletes who are qualified in equivalency sports. Second, it should avoid the dilemma which is faced at least by some student-athletes who have nonathletically related institutional aid but who have to choose between participation in the sport of their choice or that aid because the institution has reached its maximum award in that sport.

Some will argue that the possible abuses and manipulation of this legislation support defeat, but I would remind the Convention that Bylaw 6-4-(b) currently has mechanisms which allow for the verification of nonathletic institutional aid. I believe that this legislation would benefit the terribly important sports, that is, the equivalency sports. I urge the Convention to support the legislation.

Charles H. Samson (Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Council, I speak against this proposal. It is the opinion of the Council that the criteria for awarding nonathletically related financial aid vary markedly among institutions, and even among colleges within an institution. Sometimes, these awards of financial aid involve considerations other than academic qualifications.

It is the Council's concern that some awards, although now labeled athletically related, would be influenced, in fact, by the athletic abilities of the student-athlete and would create difficulties in distinguishing between appropriate and inappropriate application of the legislation. I urge defeat of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 57 (page A-62) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Maximum Awards—Equivalencies

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. President, I move adoption of No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of No. 58 again is to try to equalize things between public and private schools. The practical effect of the passage of No. 58 would take into account how much the student or the recipient of an athletic grant-in-aid still owed after the grant. This, we believe, would be fairer to the student and would put public and private institutions on a footing that is more or less equal. It also should be observed that No. 58 would also take care of the problem of out-of-state tuition. The out-of-state student-athlete would be treated the same as the in-state athlete. Now, to be sure, this could allow an institution to spend more money on an equivalency sport; but it certainly would not require an institution to do that.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): Mr. President, I rise briefly to support my friend from UCLA. Representing a private university with a tuition of more than \$9,000 this year, I can assure you the existing legislation creates problems for us in competing with the state universities in our area.

[Proposal No. 58 (pages A-62-64) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Maximum Awards—Equivalencies

Joanne S. Stevenson (Ohio State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this amendment is to equalize the value of in-state tuition with out-of-state tuition and fees so that the equivalency calculation is the same for both. Further, this proposal would greatly simplify the tracking of grants and money available for the coaches and the athletic administrators.

This amendment would establish a method of making equivalency calculations using a total-dollar value derived from the multiplication of the dollar value of one in-state grant-in-aid times the number of full grants-in-aid allowable in that sport. The out-of-state tuition would not be charged against the grant-in-aid allowance of that sport.

Hence, a particular sport would be able to give its full quota of permissible grants-in-aid without being penalized for having some out-of-state student-athletes. The proposal also provides a ceiling on the number of these out-of-state tuitions that would be paid and not counted. To quote the last sentence of the proposal, "The number of athletes in a sport receiving out-of-state

tuition and fees shall be limited to the number of full grants-in-aid for that sport."

A question has been raised about this last sentence. The question is whether or not this last sentence would mean that you could not have more out-of-state students than the number of grants-in-aid in that sport, and that is not the intent. The intent is that the ceiling would apply to the number of out-of-state tuitions that would not be counted.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): For the same reasons that I spoke in favor of No. 58, I speak against No. 59. This expands the difference between state universities and private universities.

[Proposal No. 59 (page A-64) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Maximum Awards—Division I

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, this Association has long applauded and supported institutions that present broad-based athletic programs. However, we have one piece of legislation in our book that makes us less competitive the more sports you have on the equivalency side of our financial aid program.

The paradox that is created by the sport-by-sport maximum that exists in the Manual takes care of our situation very well. However, the overall limit of 70 causes a director to have to make choices on a sport-by-sport basis in terms of awarding financial aid; and that is rendering some of the programs less competitive. I think it does no harm to remove the overall limit, and I urge the Convention to do so by adopting Proposal No. 60.

John D. Bridgers (University of New Mexico): I speak in favor of Proposal No. 60. Each men's nonrevenue sport, as all of you know, has a maximum for financial awards. Regardless of how many sports an institution sponsors, the institution is limited for each sport. By placing the overall limit of 70, an additional restriction is placed on those institutions that wish to have a broad-based program.

An institution must decide which of the sports it sponsors it wishes to deemphasize. This is an Olympic year. We all recognize that the primary training ground for our Olympic athletics has been the colleges and universities. Let's not set an arbitrary limit which might serve to deemphasize an Olympic sport which one or more institutions among us may wish to support to at least the maximum financial aid allowed. I urge you to vote in favor of No. 60.

[Proposal No. 60 (pages A-64-65) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football

Jack Friedenthal (Stanford University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 61 refers only to Division I-A football and would provide 40 initial football awards over a two-year period. This proposal is designed to provide incentives. One, to make certain the recruited athletes are those who are interested in remaining in the institution to get an education; and two, to make certain that the school does everything it can and has every incentive to keep the students there after they get there. It will be important to do that

because if students leave after they are recruited, they will not be replaced as they are today.

One of the problems that we have had with respect to this particular proposal is the fact that it is not quite understood in terms of its continuing nature. That is, the number of awards that you give each year determines that number that you can give the following year. So, if you give 20 the first year, you can give 20 the second. Then you would be able to give 20 the third. If in one year the awards go down to 17, the following year you could give 23. But the year after that you would be relegated back to 17, and the only way you could get back to 20 would be to reduce your awards to 20 instead of giving the full 23.

So, the practical effect will be to make certain that the number of awards given will be approximately 20 each year. You may go up or down a few. There was some fear that a coach, perhaps an outgoing coach leaving a program, might use up 40 and leave the successor with nothing. Well, that cannot happen because there is no time that a coach could give 40 unless in the previous year he had given none. Now, there will be no year when that will ever occur.

So I commend this to you as giving proper incentives to take students who will remain in school and to give the incentives to the school to do everything in its power to have that student continue and graduate.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): As a Furman football coach, under this scheme I could do this assuming that I do quite a bit of redshirting: in year one, I grant 40; year two, none; year three, 40, and year four, none. Then year five, 40; and I end up with 120.

Mr. Friedenthal: That is possible, but only if in the very first year you gave all 40. Remember, if you do that, you will end up a year later with only 80 while everybody else has 100. If you work it out, you will have 40, 40 and 40; but the year after you will have only 80 and a total of 20 behind everyone else. You can do that if you want to. Some of those will have to be redshirted. I would not recommend that to any athletic department, because I think it would injure your program in the long run.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): While I am in great sympathy with a proposal to set forth an initial grant of scholarships which will encourage the retention of the athletes in our programs, I feel that that could best be done by an initial grant limitation without the top limitation with certain restrictions for redshirting possibilities. I do not see that in this proposal.

I feel it is far too restrictive in that sense because it limits it to approximately an average of 20 a year; in addition to that, it would be favorable to those institutions which could actively recruit a large number of junior college students. Therefore, I urge disapproval of this item.

Mr. Friedenthal: In answer to that, it actually would be detrimental with respect to junior college students, because they would only remain in the institution for two years and could not be replaced. It would actually hurt those schools that rely on junior college transfers much more than those who rely on others.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): As far as this legislation is concerned, I am not sure whether it is good or bad. But we have developed a procedure in the last few years which has developed into some very constructive recruiting regulations. The process has gone somewhat like this: The NCAA has a Recruiting Committee. The coaches have gotten

together with other people, not the Recruiting Committee, and they have discussed possible recruiting proposals. The NCAA has then had a larger group of coaches meet in the summer, and they have discussed in detail many of the proposals which have been made by different groups. Out of that meeting, the NCAA Recruiting Committee has gotten input from coaches. They have gone back to the Council, the Council has considered it and has either come forth and proposed it or some other group has proposed it.

My objection to this piece of legislation is that nobody has had a chance to discuss it. We have not had many coaches sit around and have a little give and take as to the good points, as to the bad points, things that may be wrong about enforcement of it. We have not had input from the NCAA enforcement people. It just comes before this Convention from nowhere. I think it is dangerous for us to pass legislation until we have given it some thought. So I am against it.

[Proposal No. 61 (page A-65) was defeated by Division I-A.]

[Proposal No. 62 (pages A-65-66) was withdrawn.]

Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football

James E. Delany (Ohio Valley Conference): I rise to move adoption of Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the fourth year we have submitted a proposal of this type, and it asks for a reduction of the maximum grants limitation in Division I-AA from 75 grants to 70 grants with a head count of 95. If this proposal were adopted, it would relieve the I-AA institutions with maximum grants-in-aid limitations at exactly the halfway point between the present I-A limitations and the present Division II maximum limitations.

I think that the I-AA play-offs have shown in the last four years that institutions that are playing with 70 or less grants-in-aid can provide quality competition and yet maintain some economy as well. The effective date is August 1984, and I urge adoption of this by I-AA institutions.

Benny Hollis (Northeast Louisiana University): Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree with Mr. Delany and I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 63. It seems that each year the members of I-AA must deal with an attempt to reduce the scholarship limit from its present maximum of 75. Proposal No. 63, as you have heard, is such another attempt.

I believe the reduction of the scholarships in I-AA would not be in the best interest of I-AA football. Many of you know that there is an excellent brand of football played in Division I-AA. We have been able to maintain that excellent brand of football through the last several years. I encourage you, and speaking on behalf of all of the seven members of the Southland Conference, we request your assistance to defeat Proposal No. 63.

Roosevelt Wilson (Florida A&M University): Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 63. I believe that if we are not careful we will get ourselves into serious deterioration of I-AA football. At this point, there is some very fine competition between I-AA and I-A institutions; and I think this is made possible by the size of the scholarships in I-AA.

I think we have to be careful that we do not widen the gap between I-A and I-AA so that we can continue to play some of the traditional games that we used to play when there were some schools that are now in I-AA which used to be in I-A. I also would urge defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 63 (page A-66) was approved by Division I-AA. A subsequent motion to reconsider was defeated.]

Maximum Awards—Men's Ice Hockey

Otto Breitenbach (University of Wisconsin, Madison): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

In light of the failure of Proposal No. 60, this piece of legislation becomes extremely important to ice hockey schools in Division I. The discrepancies referred to by the presenter of No. 60 are even greater for the athletes that are in schools that have Division I men's ice hockey programs.

Ice hockey is an extremely important part of our program from a competitive viewpoint, but also very important from a financial viewpoint. Ice hockey provides a very significant portion of our total income that helps us provide for the comprehensive program that we have in our schools. The fact that we must use 20 of our 70 grants for ice hockey leaves our other equivalency sports at a distinct disadvantage.

I know this is unique to a small group of schools, but I would like to urge the Convention to consider this unique situation and permit us to eliminate those 20 grants and be allowed to give 70 full grants to our equivalency sports athletes.

[Proposal No. 64 (pages A-66-76) was defeated by Division I.]

Multiple Sport Participants—Women

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I move adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is quite apparent. Field hockey is one of the sports where there is another sport—lacrosse—which is often played by the same student-athletes. The concern is that once an institution has reached its maximum number of grants in the sport of field hockey, the additional grant might be given in another sport and those athletes participate and get those benefits in the sport of field hockey.

Jeanne Rowlands (Northeastern University): Speaking against No. 65, the effect of this legislation would be to prohibit an athlete aided in an activity such as lacrosse from participating as a beginner in field hockey if the field hockey team is at the maximum athletic aid. If the concern comes from those who do not sponsor a program in women's lacrosse, for example, I would respectfully suggest that rather than solving the problem by limiting the participation of other student-athletes, those concerned expand their programs to include women's lacrosse.

[Proposal No. 65 (page A-67) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Individual Outside Competition

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to impose limited restrictions on the ability of student-athletes involved in the "individual" sports to refrain from participating in outside competition during the intercollegiate season. This would be the same as current restrictions on student-athletes participating on team sports in so-called outside competition.

The legislation will prevent student-athletes in sports such as tennis or golf from participating as individuals on their own behalf, not as members of their intercollegiate teams or as a representative of their college, in outside competition which occurs during the season of that individual's intercollegiate sport.

Existing NCAA regulations require student-athletes on team sports to make the choice of participating as a member of their intercollegiate team during their season or participating as a member of some outside team. In the same sense, this legislation requires student-athletes in individual sports to make the same choice. I believe we adopted the restrictions on team sports to prevent individuals from disrupting the season of an intercollegiate team. The same can occur in sports classified as individual if team members are not restricted to their intercollegiate schedule during their season. Current NCAA legislation does not provide any restrictions whatsoever on outside competition by student-athletes in the individual sports. It should be noted that the restriction on such individuals would not apply to the student-athlete who may wish to participate on his or her own behalf as an individual with outside competition on Sundays or during the institution's vacation periods that occur during the playing season of his or her sport, provided the student-athlete has been granted permission for such participation by the athletics authorities at his or her institution.

We think the restrictions imposed by Proposal No. 66 are appropriate and not overly restrictive and would work to the betterment of our intercollegiate athletic programs.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): Mr. President, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 66. I feel it is an attempt to abrogate the responsibilities of individual programs and individual institutions to control the activities of their student-athletes. In many of these sports, particularly indoor track, tennis and golf, there are gaps in the seasons during the week where individual athletes may have the opportunity to compete on their own.

I do not think the rules applying to team sports necessarily ought to apply to individual athletes. I would like to see No. 66 defeated.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): This would work a real hardship on sports such as golf and tennis, which are essentially individual in nature. It would wipe out the possibility of such wonderful experiences such as a master's tournament in golf, the North-South Amateur, things of this sort which the students are able to plan for and work into a normal program without missing any more work than would be done in a team sport without all those. I am very much against this, especially since these events do not occur on Sunday.

Richard H. Perry (University of Southern California): I would speak strongly in opposition to No. 66 as being against the highly skilled athlete, particularly in the areas that we have described as the Olympic sports and as just previously mentioned, the areas of tennis and golf. Many of our most gifted athletes, for instance, will be invited to participate in some of the most prestigious invitational events around the country providing them with the type of competition that helps them to become world-class athletes.

To deny them that opportunity seems to me to be an unreasonable restriction. It is one that would not be in the best interest of the student-athlete.

[Proposal No. 66 (pages A-67-68) was defeated.]
[Proposal No. 67 (pages A-68-69) was withdrawn.]

Individual Eligibility

Robert W. Hatch (Bates College): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

Also, I move adoption of the amendment-to-the-amendment, No. 68-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 68-1 really just changes one word. "Returning" is replaced with the word "reentering."

[Proposal No. 68-1 (pages A-69-70) was defeated by all divisions.]

Mr. Hatch: The intent of Proposal No. 68 is to treat athletes throughout the country, between the fall and spring terms, as athletes would be treated when they enter the college; that is, if at all possible, to permit the athlete to participate before he or she attends a class. This is merely to make it possible for a reentering student to participate prior to attending classes during other intervening times between semesters.

Thomas J. Frericks (University of Dayton): Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the delegates at the Convention that this legislation will be much more permissive than the current legislation relative to students entering in the second term. I think it is not clearly read and can be overlooked.

[Proposal No. 68 (page A-69) was defeated by all divisions.]

Transfer Rule—Subvarsity Competition

Alvin R. Paul (Columbia University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit students from junior colleges who transfer to four-year colleges the opportunity to participate in their sport immediately upon transfer, provided that such participation occurs only at subvarsity levels and that subvarsity competition is counted as one of the student-athlete's seasons of competition in the sport involved.

For many years, prior to the recent adoption of legislation which requires NCAA Bylaw 5 to become the minimum standard for regular-season competition, it was permissible under NCAA regulations for a transfer student to represent the institution and be immediately eligible for regular-season subvarsity competition, with that competition counting as one season of eligibility.

Therefore, I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 69.

[Proposal No. 69 (page A-76) was approved by Division III; defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Seasons of Competition

William P. Holowaty (Eastern Connecticut State University): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is to reduce some confusion that we have in the Northeast in many schools that are participating in informal offseason programs in having hardship cases come up with the 50-percent rule in effect.

I will give you a couple of examples. A participant in baseball a couple of

years ago participated in an informal fall program with no umpires, then was in a car accident and was not able to participate in the springtime; and one season of eligibility was declared on him. We had a student-athlete who had no scholarship money at a Division II school this past fall who participated in one informal baseball game, was cut by that program and wanted to transfer to another institution. He lost one season of participation.

Many times, schools are having confusion interpreting this eligibility rule. We had a Division II athlete who was told after transferring that his fall participation in an informal program was not counted toward eligibility. This is many times being confused. The proposal would give a student-athlete four years of participation in a fall offseason program and in a spring intercollegiate program, and vice versa.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): I would like to urge support of this amendment, which is for eligibility only. In the Northeast, we have very short spring seasons, basically four or five weeks at the most. To be able to compete with other teams around the nation, we have developed fall programs in most of the spring sports.

It is necessary for us to do that, as I said, for competitive purposes. As Bill has ably illustrated, the fall would effectively prevent some hardship exceptions because of fall competition. I might also mention that there is a precedent in the rules in regard to cross country, indoor and outdoor track in a similar situation. I urge that we support this amendment.

David L. Maggard (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal. There is no clear definition of what is necessary to be considered two separate seasons in a sport. This simply creates more paper work for the administrative bureaucracy.

Proposal No. 70 also may have the effect of inequitable application for those who have year-round programs and are not able to take advantage of hardship rules and waivers due to their sport not being divided into two separate seasons. This is undesirable legislation, and I urge you to vote against this proposal.

Mr. Holowaty: I would have to disagree with that gentleman. There are defined seasons. I think there are more inequities without such a proposal than there are with one. I think this will clarify things for many schools who are even not counting informal or winter soccer programs at this time. Let's take, for example, a student who comes in for the first semester at Eastern Connecticut State University and participates in one indoor soccer game that is informal. This student has used one year of eligibility. Now, I do not think every school is counting that as a year of eligibility. This will be specific—that there would be four semesters of spring soccer. I think this will clarify many times these misgivings.

[Proposal No. 70 (pages A-70-71) was defeated by all divisions.]

Eligibility—Junior College Transfer

Dorothy E. Dreyer (Wayne State University (Michigan)): Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the Community and Junior College Relations Committee and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would prohibit a junior college transfer from competing on behalf of a junior college program and an NCAA member in the same sport

season. This is a problem of particular concern to the junior college programs and would not appear to adversely affect the NCAA's schools. Therefore, I urge your support for this proposal in all three divisions.

[Proposal No. 71 (page A-71) was approved by all divisions.]

Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception

H. George Frederickson (Eastern Washington University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment would provide for a one-time transfer from one senior college to another without the penalty of the one-year residency requirement. The one-time transfer would function under the following conditions: First, the student either has not received athletically related financial assistance or the student's athletically related financial assistance has been discontinued by the original institution. Second, the student must be in good academic standing. Third, the student's original institution must certify that it has no objection to the transfer and to the exception to the transfer residency requirement. Fourth, the student is a participant in a sport other than football or men's basketball. I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[Proposal No. 72 (pages A-71-72) was approved by all divisions (152-128 in Division I, 82-42 in Division II, 90-71 in Division III.)]

Transfer Rule—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

Delegates who were present at the NCAA Convention in January 1982 will recall that legislation was adopted which would permit a waiver of the residency requirement for a student-athlete transferring from one four-year college to another provided the student never had been recruited, never had received any athletically related financial assistance and never had practiced or competed in any intercollegiate athletic activity prior to his transfer.

Therefore, the transfer-rule waiver which was adopted, Bylaw 5-(1)-(m)-(10), was to provide immediate eligibility for a transferring student-athlete who had virtually no exposure whatsoever to intercollegiate athletics at member colleges. One might label this legislation as a waiver of the transfer rule for the mere walk-on student. The sponsors of Proposal No. 73 have experienced situations where the same walk-on student who has never been recruited, has never received athletic-related financial aid and has never participated in intercollegiate athletics may perhaps have participated one, two or three days in a preseason tryout in a particular sport.

In almost every case, that limited preseason tryout has been found to be nothing more than a mere formality on the part of the institution, yet the student is immediately cut off from any further participation. It seems to us that the mere walk-on student with limited preseason tryout experience is still, in fact, a pure walk-on. Therefore, it seems logical that there is equal justification for providing that same student a waiver of the residency requirement of the transfer rule.

[Proposal No. 73 (page A-72) was approved by Division III, defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Transfer Rule—Division III

Elizabeth A. Kruczek (Fitchburg State College): On behalf of the Council and the Division III Steering Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 74 simply intends to permit a student transferring to a Division III institution from a Division I or Division II institution after competing at the previous institution to be immediately eligible if the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the previous institution.

The Division III Steering Committee encourages the adoption of Proposal No. 74 in order to allow student-athletes who transfer to Division III to be immediately eligible, which is in concert with our Division III philosophy of participation, provided the written release is received. A point of clarification is that the written release should be obtained as soon as the initial contract has been made and definitely before practice begins.

[Proposal No. 74 (page A-72) was approved by Division III.]

Five-Year Rule—Waivers

Robert J. Myslik (Princeton University): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 75, on behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to authorize the NCAA Council to extend the five-year period of eligibility for student-athletes at Division I colleges when they have participated in official Pan-American and Olympic training, tryouts and competitions and in official tryouts in competition involving other national teams as specified in the proposal.

There seems to be a growing number of us who have been privileged to have student-athletes on our campuses who have qualified for Olympic-level competition; and the amount of time and effort that is required for the student-athlete to gain the necessary training and competitive experience required to be successful in today's Olympic Games gets to the point where student-athletes must consider a leave of absence from college. In some cases, such aspiring athletes are compelled to take a full year's leave of absence, or more, from their college work. Some may never return to this campus and complete their studies within a five-year period dating from this initial college enrollment. There are other occasions, however, when the same Olympian cannot complete his or her academic work or is otherwise denied the privilege of participating in all four seasons of competition to which he or she is entitled to in this five-year period of eligibility.

In those instances, it would seem fair that NCAA regulations not penalize such a student by denying an opportunity to gain a fourth season of competition because he or she had used up one semester or one year of the five-year period of eligibility for participation or training for participation in the Olympic Games.

The legislation provides that all such cases be reviewed by the NCAA Council, thus maintaining appropriate control over the extension of the five-year period, as may be granted to student-athletes in this category. We urge the adoption of Proposal No. 75.

[Proposal No. 75 (pages A-71-73) was approved by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 76.

The intent of No. 76 is to remedy an inequity resulting from retroactive adoption of the freshman redshirt rule in January 1982. It would restore a season of competition to a student-athlete who competed in a small number of games prior to January 1982 as a freshman, unaware that such competition was costing him or her a season of eligibility.

As an example, at our university we have two students who competed as freshmen in football for a single series of downs. When the freshman redshirt rule came into effect retroactively, this minimal amount of competition precluded those students from another season of competition as compared with those freshmen students who did not compete at all. We believe this is inequitable. Proposal No. 76 is intended to remedy that by giving those students who competed as freshmen in fewer than 20 percent of the events or two games, whichever is greater, an additional year of eligibility.

Now, a few points about this proposal. First of all, the criterion which is used is the same as that used now in the case of injury, so it is a criterion with which we are familiar. Secondly, Proposal No. 76 is limited to athletes who competed as freshmen before January 1982. Therefore, this rule operates only through January 1986, to correct the inequity that resulted from the retroactive change in the rule.

Now, some have expressed concern that adoption of this rule would present some record-keeping problems to determine whether or not the criterion was satisfied. I note that to some extent that problem is present now in determining whether an athlete competed at all. I would like to note as part of the legislative history of Proposal No. 76 that the burden should be on the school of the student-athlete to maintain such records to show that the criterion had been satisfied whenever a challenge is raised.

With that history, I hope that those of you who have some concern about records will find it possible to support Proposal No. 76. Many of you have athletes in this unfortunate position that resulted from the retroactive adoption of the freshman redshirt rule. I hope you will support the proposal. Even if you do not have athletes who find themselves so unfortunately affected, I hope you will recognize the inequity of the situation and support this very limited remedial rule. We urge your support of Proposal No. 76.

[Proposal No. 76 (pages A-73-74) was approved by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): On behalf of the Council and the Division I Steering Committee, I move adoption of No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Council and other groups have found that we are having more and more foreign students coming in above the age of 20 who have some tenuous connection with the military or the foreign service of their country, or even some tenuous religious connection. A legal question has been raised as to whether or not our legal counsel could defend the NCAA in any suit concerning those students' eligibility because we have an exception for armed services of the United States and the foreign service of the United States. Our legal counsel has told us that this would not hold up in court; and, therefore, we are moving that these exceptions be removed. Now, I do

want to point out there are somewhat similar exceptions in the five-year rule. But this has nothing to do with the five-year rule, only the rule concerning participation after the age of 20.

Col. Harvey Schiller (U.S. Air Force Academy): I would like to express an opinion against the time spent in the armed services with the exception to participation in organized competition after a student's 20th birthday. We have a long list of high school graduates who enter military service at approximately 18 years of age, where it is normally a four-year enlistment. Almost all of these service people are involved in some form of organized competition during this period. For many, this is not only a time to serve their country but also a time to ensure and accumulate funds for a college education. Many in this room have profited by this military experience themselves. Potential student-athletes now serving around the world would be harmed by participation and organized competition such as base intramural teams.

Service in our armed forces should not result in a loss of opportunity to compete as a student-athlete following college injury.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to echo the same comments and then ask a question. What is the interpretation relating to student-athletes who have signed letters of intent during this past winter who are members of the armed forces? My concern is that if there are student-athletes who have signed letters of intent and we then pass this legislation, that would be unfair to those student-athletes. I think we need to know that before we vote on this.

Prseident Toner: I don't know whether anyone on the Steering Committee has a response to that question or whether or not we should delay further consideration until we can come up with that answer, Frank. I think on that question we will adjourn for the evening and come back in the morning.

[The Convention recessed at 6 p.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Morning, January 11, 1984

The session convened at 8 a.m. with President John L. Toner presiding.

8. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

President Toner: At the conclusion of the business session yesterday, we left Proposal No. 77 in the midst of debate and adjourned following a question relative to a letter of intent and whether it would be binding under this legislation. This morning, the Administrative Committee developed an interpretation on behalf of the Council that if a member institution has exercised a written binding agreement with any prospective student-athlete by way of a National Letter of Intent or any other form of commitment, then that would be interpreted as permissible under this legislation.

[Proposal No. 77 (page A-74) was approved by Division I.]

Seasons Of Competition

C. Donald Cook (Fairfield University): Mr. President, on behalf of the ECAC Committee on Eligibility, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of No. 78 is to ensure that student-athletes at Division I member colleges whose eligibility is affected by the so-called "20-year-old rule" shall not be charged with more than one season of eligibility in their sport during any calendar year after the student's 20th birthday. The sponsors of this legislation have encountered cases where such students have been charged with as many as three seasons of eligibility in their sport in a given calendar year.

There are other numerous situations involving Division I student-athletes who have turned 20 years of age prior to enrollment in an NCAA member institution, where they must be charged with two seasons of competition in their sport in one calendar year if Bylaw 5-(1)-(d)-(3) is applied correctly in accordance with the interpretations we have given by the NCAA office.

Let me cite the following two examples to illustrate my point. A student-athlete plans to enroll at a particular Division I member college and expects to participate in intercollegiate soccer. The student-athlete has never attended college previously but has turned 20 years of age as of the month of June prior to his initial enrollment date. During the summer following his 20th birthday, this student participates as a member of an outside soccer team and because of that experience the student is charged with one season of eligibility in the sport of soccer. While still 20 years of age, the student then enrolls in a college as expected and participates during his freshman year on the varsity soccer squad. The student then must be charged with a second year of eligibility in the sport of soccer.

Now, a second player, on the other hand, enrolls in the same Division I member institution. This individual, however, does not turn 20 years of age until September 1, just prior to his enrollment date. He also participates in outside soccer during the summer prior to his enrollment which participation

ends prior to September 1. He also participates as a member of his intercollegiate varsity team immediately upon enrollment. Following the completion of his freshman year, the second student-athlete also now is 20 years of age charged with his first year of season of competition in the sport of soccer. In the above cases, both students are 20 years of age while competing as freshmen on their institution's varsity soccer team.

At the conclusion of the first season of intercollegiate competition, the first student must be charged with two years of eligibility in soccer and the second student is charged with only one season of eligibility in soccer. The sponsors of this proposal are not opposed to the basic intent of the rule. We feel, however, that it is unfair for a student-athlete who is 20 years of age upon enrollment in college to be charged with a second year of competition in his sport only because of the timing of his birth date. Proposal No. 78 would alleviate this inequity and we urge its adoption by this Convention.

[Proposal No. 78 (pages A-74-75) was approved by Division I.]

Student-Athlete Statement—Gambling Activities

Cecil N. Coleman (Midwestern City Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

I call your attention now to the amendment-to-the-amendment, No. 79-1, and I move adoption of that proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reason for No. 79-1 is that legal counsel has advised the Council to restrict its prohibition to intercollegiate sports. Therefore, the underlying message concerning intercollegiate athletic competition is what has been added.

[Proposal No. 79-1 (page A-75) was approved.]

The 1983 Convention adopted Resolution No. 134 recommending that the NCAA Council and Executive Committee take a variety of actions concerning gambling in intercollegiate athletics. One such action was to draft language amending Constitution 3-9-(i) to require student-athletes to provide information concerning involvement in any type of organized gambling activity on team or individual sports.

This information would include identifying whether or not the student-athlete has provided information to assist any individual known to be involved in organized gambling activities; soliciting or accepting a bet on any intercollegiate team, or participation in any gambling activity involving intercollegiate athletics through a bookmaker, parlay card, or any other method employed by organized gambling. I urge you to affirm this action that was directed to the Council by the Convention last year as Resolution No. 134.

[Proposal No. 79 (page A-75) was approved as amended by No. 79-1.]

President Toner: I would like to make one announcement and then interrupt the order of amendment consideration to take care of important Convention business—the report of the Nominating Committees and the Committees on Committees. First, following the Council's deliberations last night and early morning in the administrative meeting, it would seem appropriate at this time to entertain a motion to reorder consideration of Proposal Nos. 123 through 131.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I move the reordering of

Nos. 123 through 131.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

9. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

President Toner: We will now recognize Chuck Samson, chair of the Nominating Committee, for his report.

Charles H. Samson (Texas A&M University): As prescribed in Constitution 5-1-(a)-(4), Divisions I, II and III elected their representatives to the NCAA Council at their respective round-table meetings. Those elected by the three divisions are listed in Appendix A of the 1984 Convention Program.

I move the election of Ade L. Sponberg, vice-president of Division II, and Elizabeth A. Kruczek, vice-president of Division III, be ratified by this Convention.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

10. REPORT OF THE WOMEN'S COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

President Toner: We will now entertain a report of the Women's Committee on Committees.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Women's Committee on Committees, I move acceptance of the committee's 1984 report.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

11. REPORT OF THE MEN'S COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

President Toner: Now, we will return to Ken Germann to report on the Men's Committee on Committees.

Kenneth G. Germann (Southern Conference): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen, you have before you the report of the 1984 Men's Committee on Committees, and I move the acceptance of that report.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

12. COUNCIL RECOGNITION

President Toner: I would like to take this opportunity to join with the Convention delegates in thanking and wishing well the retiring members of the Council. They are: John W. Sawyer, Edwin W. Lawrence, Billy M. Miller, P. LaVerne Sweat, Donald M. Russell and Kenneth J. Weller. Thank you for a job very well done.

13. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Division I-A Meeting

Unidentified Delegate: I voted with the prevailing side on Proposal No. 38, and I would like to move to reconsider.

[The motion was seconded.]

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to encourage all those institutions that are Division I basketball schools without Division I football to allow the Division I-A football schools to have a meeting where they can discuss those problems that are important to the sport of football, which is the major component of their athletic programs. I think to deny this opportunity is unfair to them and is not in the spirit of the NCAA.

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): I want to echo the sentiments of Frank for Division I-AA to allow I-A to have its meeting and

be able to discuss football issues.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): Particularly do I wish to speak to my colleagues in Division II and remind them that we are here and we have responsibilities to our institutions. Secondly, I believe we have a responsibility to this thing called an association. An association means a relationships with others and an association, like a relationship, needs to be nurtured; it needs to be paid attention to. We are responsible not for one another but towards one another. I urge my colleagues in Division II to vote positively, to vote for this enabling legislation, to vote for the Association.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I would like to address the Division II delegates in particular, to recall that the Division II Steering Committee recommended at our round table that we vote for this proposal in order that the Division I-A institutions could meet and enact legislation relating to football, which is the only sport that Division I-A can deal with. I would urge all of them to vote for reconsideration and approval of Proposal No. 38.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University, New York): The Council members representing all Division I members other than football-playing schools met after the business session yesterday to discuss legislation. This particular item took a lot of our time. We think that it would be very appropriate at this time for all delegates to the Convention to allow Division I to meet next summer to act on football legislation. I might mention that St. John's University voted for that item yesterday. I would ask that you all consider that very clearly and deeply.

Richard M. Trachok (University of Nevada, Reno): We encourage your support also. We are a I-AA institution. Yesterday we voted against the proposition and today we are going to vote for it.

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): I am speaking for all the members of the Pacific-10 Conference, and we urge our friends in Division II to support this. It is important for our members and other members of Division I-A to get together in the month of June and talk about items that concern only Division I-A and plan for the Association's Convention within the rules of the NCAA. I urge support of this resolution.

Charles H. Samson (Texas A&M University): I wish to speak in favor of Proposal No. 38. In the interest of the future of the NCAA, it is imperative that the Association recognize the importance those I-A institutions attached to Proposal Nos. 37 and 38 that were defeated yesterday. Those of you who have attended previous NCAA Conventions are aware of the frustration of I-A schools in not having a sufficient opportunity through the Association to interact with each other and to develop legislation that would speak to the concerns of I-A schools.

These frustrations have led in recent times to the suggestion of rather drastic approaches. The most moderate have believed that working through the regular legislative channels of the NCAA could produce the structures and the climate that would be compatible with the needs of all member institutions.

I must say the action taken yesterday in defeating Proposal Nos. 38 and 39 is a step backward, a serious step backward. These proposals would not destroy the basic integrity of the NCAA structures yet would still go a long ways toward meeting the needs of I-A schools. The holding of the summer meeting by I-A as proposed by Proposal No. 38 would be a positive step in the NCAA, and I urge you not to underestimate the force of this issue and I

urge that you give favorable consideration to the passage of 38.

[Proposal No. 38 (pages A-50-51) was approved.]

Division I Voting

Charles A. Eberle (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 37, and I would like to move to reconsider No. 37 in Division II.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Toner: Division II has moved to reconsider now. They have a right to have the reconsideration done only once. If one chooses not to do this now and does it later, we will reactivate Division II. We do not have to reconsider at this time. We can wait. The item is still open at a later time.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Although I voted on the prevailing side yesterday and although I still remain against the concept of a divided legislative assembly, I think it is only fair that we have an opportunity for Division I-A football to know whether they can reconsider this issue at this time. I so move.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Financial Aid—Pell Grants

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 50, and I would like to have it reconsidered.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to urge this body to reconsider their vote on the Pell Grant. This body, I think, is very sensitive to student needs. We all know of instances of student-athletes who have severe needs and cannot afford to go home at vacation time or Christmas time, and we limit the amount they can work. The Pell Grants are handled totally outside of athletic aid; and, therefore, the abuse of this is not possible. I believe if we are concerned with those who have severe financial needs that we would be in favor of Pell Grants being available to our student-athletes. I urge you to pass this motion.

Jack V. Doland (McNeese State University): I also urge you to pass No. 50. The basketball coaches' association at the summer meeting representing all of Division I was unanimous that the Pell Grants be eliminated from consideration. We did get a compromise of \$900 for some of the smaller institutions that use these. It was also unanimous in the American Football Coaches Association, representing Divisions I-A and I-AA; and the consensus was that \$900 would be a fair situation for the needy students. I urge support of No. 50.

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): I would like to call the attention of the membership to what a number of us who have been involved with this over the years, particularly those of us who have had administrative experience within our institutions, have concluded. That is that this is money which is entitlement money to the student. It comes to the student whether or not he or she is an athlete. Moreover, many of us feel it is really almost illegal for us to deny them this money. Many of us who operated within the AIAW for a number of years found that with our women's students this worked very well and very effectively, and so far as I know provided no competitive advantage.

Finally, I believe there are a number of schools who have voted against this that believe that somehow or another, some people gain an advantage as a

result of this and they can use this money themselves to offset other money which students are entitled. They cannot. Somehow, some day, some student is going to claim what is rightfully his or hers and we are going to be embarrassed by it.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): Those of us who favored this proposal over the years are at a disadvantage, because those that oppose it never seem to give us their arguments and reasons that they are against the Pell Grant money going to the athletes who have earned it. One of two things is happening. Either the Federal government is subsidizing our athletic departments or we are paying for athletic-related aid with the athletes' own money. If either one of those things is occurring, it is unfair, it is illegal, it is immoral and we really should reconsider what we are doing to the athlete in not giving them an opportunity to take the money they have earned on need and not on athletic ability.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): Speaking on behalf of almost all of the Division I-A football coaches, in the meetings we have had for the last three years we have almost unanimously asked for the \$900 in the Pell Grants for our athletes. I would like to again just emphasize that we are not asking for money so the kids can buy a car, we are not asking for money for the kid who does not need the spending money, we are not asking for money for the kids that come from middle-class families; we are asking for money that the kid is entitled to who cannot go down and buy a hamburger or go to a movie, or buy a shirt that he likes.

I do not see how we can ask our young people to get in the mainstream of a campus life, and think they can have a complete education with experience when they have to go together in groups and cannot really participate in some of the things because they do not have the dignity of a \$20 bill in their pocket if they want to do something. I think it is totally unfair. I think we deprive them of part of the educational experience they should have, and I think that we really owe it to them. Again, for the kid who doesn't have a \$10 bill and cannot buy what he absolutely needs, this would put them in a situation where they would feel comfortable with their fellow students. I think it is important that we pass this.

Donald M. Russell (Wesleyan University): I have sat in the back of the room and have watched our people vote. I have no vested interest in this particular amendment, but I do have a right to vote on it and I voted for it yesterday. I am rather appalled to see the institutions that are voting against this amendment. I agree with Mr. Weaver. I would like to hear some explanation of why they are against it. I can only see it as being very selfish and discriminating against the student-athlete.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I would echo those sentiments and urge this Convention that if no one rises to speak against this there must be no reason not to support the Pell Grant being awarded rightfully to our students and we should unanimously at this time approve the amendment.

[Proposal No. 50 (page A-58) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 80 (page A-76) was withdrawn.]

Establishment of Championships

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I move adoption of Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this amendment is to deal with all of the championships established by the Association. It does not expand the scope of what the Association is currently offering. When Executive Regulation I was passed, it was effective in 1979-80, and the sports it covered were obviously men's sports. With the beginning of women's programs in 1981-82, and later 1982-83, of the 14 women's sports that were established by the Association, 12 were already covered under the more-lenient regulations of Executive Regulation I by virtue of the fact that men participated in those same sports. Only two of the women's sports which are well-established sports have not been covered and, therefore, are forced to meet the requirements of the more stringent 25-percent regulation for continuation.

What this amendment would do would be to take those two women's sports — field hockey and fast-pitch softball — already established and treat them in the same manner that the other women's sports and all the established men's sports are being treated. I urge your adoption of this motion.

Connie Claussen (University of Nebraska, Omaha): The Executive Committee and the Championships Standards Committee oppose this proposal. Currently, the sponsorship for field hockey and fast-pitch softball is as follows: fast-pitch Division I sponsorship, 50 percent; Division II, 45 percent; Division III, 40 percent. Division I field hockey sponsorship is 81 percent; Division III is 54 percent. This shows that sponsorship is not near the 25 percent or the 20 percent which would allow the championships to continue.

So, I do not see that it is a problem whether the limit should be 25 percent or 20 percent. It was originally thought that this would allow the Division II field hockey championship to be reestablished, but if it would be under the 20-percent sponsorship level, then Division II field hockey does not qualify—either at 25 percent or 20 percent. The sport would need 40 institutions to be at 20 percent, and currently it is at 31.

It should be noted that the current percentage requirements were adopted by the membership because they were believed to be equitable and sound figures upon which to base a championship. Revising them in order to accommodate a particular sport is not necessarily compatible with the original intent in establishing these regulations.

Ms. Taylor: I would like to clarify that the intent of this was not because of any specific championships. We understand this application to Division II. It is not because any of the other division championships in those two sports were in danger. It was simply a fairness issue. We felt that the regulation as passed was to deal with established championships rather than those that are in the developmental stage. Neither of those two sports for the women are in a developmental stage. They are well-established championships, and we felt they should be treated in the same way as the other 12 sports previously established.

[Proposal No. 81 (pages A-76-77) was approved.]

Continuation of Championships

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 82.

I move the amendment-to-the-amendment, Proposal No. 82-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The original proposal was rather open-ended and could cause a championship to continue under the circumstances cited even if there were only two schools that were participating in that sport. The amendment, No. 82-1, establishes a time limit through the 1987-88 academic year and establishes a minimum of at least 50 institutions participating. I urge adoption of Amendment No. 82-1.

Corey Van Fleet (California State University, Long Beach): I am a member of the Men's Water Polo Committee, and we believe that in the interest of the United States water polo program it is advisable to retain this particular sport. The passage of this legislation would do that.

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I am rising to strongly support Proposal No. 82 and urge all delegates to support it. Without supporting No. 82 in 1984, there will be no NCAA championship in men's water polo, an Olympic sport. And there will be the possibility of no championships in men's and women's fencing, men's and women's rifle, men's and women's skiing, and even indoor track and volleyball if the numbers fall below the seven-percent level.

In the ECAC caucus on Sunday, there was unanimous support for No. 82. I believe the NCAA Executive Committee is now supporting it, as amended, with a minimum of 50 schools and a time limit of 1987-88. I think we want to have championships in sports that have an Olympic program. I strongly urge support of Proposal No. 82.

[Proposal No. 82-1 (pages A-77-78) was approved.]

Mr. Geiger: Like Mr. Van Fleet, I am also a member of the NCAA Men's Water Polo Committee. This grand sport is in some difficulty. It has 52 participating institutions. Over the last 15 years, the number of institutions sponsoring this sport has fluctuated between 51 and 59 schools. However, the NCAA membership has grown considerably during that time and the percentage of schools participating has dwindled.

We have already heard about the fact this is an Olympic sport and an endangered species. I speak on behalf of those members that believe in broadly based programs and in sponsoring activities that have good meaning for the youngsters on our campuses. The NCAA championship is an incentive for this program. There is a lot of work around the country on the expansion of this sport of water polo. I urge the Convention to keep this great sport going as an NCAA activity.

Mr. Van Fleet: Specifically, this will allow the National Collegiate Men's Water Polo Championship to continue, despite the fact that it has fallen below the required minimum sponsorship for two consecutive years and was to be discontinued after the 1984 Olympics. At the 1982 Convention, Executive Regulation 1-(1)-(d) was amended to state that no championship established prior to 1981-82 would be discontinued prior to the Olympics. Sponsors of that legislation were in favor of our extension of the men's water polo championship believing it would encourage institutions to maintain their programs and sports. Now that the Olympics are imminent, another solution is being sought. I think revision of some executive regulation to accommodate a specific championship does not appear to be in the best interest of the entire membership.

This amendment, if it were to be adopted, we would be applying a set of regulations to all National Collegiate Championships.

Richard H. Perry (University of Southern California): I take exception

with the Executive Committee's thinking process as it relates to the Olympic sports. It seems to me there is definitely a uniqueness with respect to the Olympic sports in the model that the United States presents to the rest of the world. We have been exposed quite often to the Iron Curtain model of nationalized sporting teams, with people culminating their experience with little or nothing to do other than be an ex-gymnast or ex-water polo player, or ex-whatever.

At our honors luncheon, one of the Silver Anniversary award-winners, you may recall, was there by virtue of having been an alternate on our Olympic water polo team and going on to be a sufficiently successful person so that this body would honor him. Consistently in our honors luncheon, we made reference to our great contributions to the Olympic movement. It seems to be incongruous that we establish legislation that would disenfranchise persons on our campuses who participate in the Olympic activities.

To do so, I think all we have to do is once again look at the historical model that has already invaded our area with the national women's volleyball federation, taking women off of our campuses three years prior to the 1980 games. Six young ladies were taken from our campuses and told they must go to Colorado if they elected to participate in the 1980 games. They spent three years of their life preparing for the 1980 games outside of intercollegiate competition and did not get a chance to participate because the Olympics were not held. Then they spent the next four years in preparation for the 1984 games. Those young ladies were all at about 3.000 GPAs, and the contribution they will be making after they have finished their volleyball experience is highly negligible. If we deny the opportunity to stay in school it seems we do a great disservice to this country in a model that has proven itself to be paramount throughout the world in terms of the development of world-class athletes who also turn into world-class citizens.

John C. Parry (Brown University): I would like to again emphasize that water polo is a national sport. It is played on both coasts with an Eastern championship as well as a Western championship. An interesting point for the Convention, is that with the passage of Proposal No. 23, which eliminates from the counting procedures of sports sponsorships all women's programs, the required number of schools sponsoring water polo to satisfy this requirement would be 52.9 schools. Right now there are 52 schools sponsoring water polo. If we could get a ruling to round down, water polo would qualify. I am trying to point out that being that close, we think it is a sport that you should not stop supporting.

[Proposal No. 82 (page A-77) was approved as amended by Proposal No. 82-1.]

[Proposal No. 83 (page A-78) was withdrawn. The proposal subsequently was approved. See discussion following Proposal No. 85.]

Division III Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 84 establishes a Division III Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships. Currently, there are 92 institutions with women's indoor track and there are 130 institutions with men's indoor track,

percentages of 29 and 41 percent, respectively. Both meet the required number for a national championship.

John C. Martin (Fisk University): I am the chair of the Division III men's track and field subcommittee. For five years, the committee, along with the Division III track coaches association, have asked for an indoor championship. I urge that we do adopt this championship.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): As a member of the Championships Standards Committee and also the Executive Committee, we discussed this and considered the proposal on Saturday. I believe it was the unanimous decision of both groups not to support this proposition. The rationale for this was that we were projecting a cost of \$175,000 of deficit spending for this particular championship. Also, in projecting the participation ratios which we use basically of one-to-16 for individuals, it appeared that in Division III you would have no more than one-to-six for the women and one-to-12 for the men.

It is difficult to speak against a proposal whereby you are providing more opportunities for students, but when you consider the deficit spending that we project of \$175,000 and the participation ratios that are under the standard that we have used for all three divisions, then we oppose this particular proposal.

Nell C. Jackson (State University of New York, Binghamton): I would like to urge your support of this motion. The standards for the open indoor track championships are really too high for Division III student-athletes to meet. There are a sufficient number of student-athletes, both men and women, who could and really need an indoor championship. Therefore, I urge you to support this motion.

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): I would like to urge support of this proposal. In New England, and I think other parts of the country as well, the main track season, the most important track season, is the indoor season because of the short academic calendars and weather conditions in the spring. In our institution, and in a number of other institutions, this is definitely true. There is no championship possibility for those athletes who have this as their main season. I would like to urge support of this amendment.

Mr. Jacoby: I would like to just state we do have an indoor track championship for all three divisions. If any students in Divisions I, II and III meet those standards, they qualify for the division. So we are not denying anyone that opportunity to participate if they meet the standards. To keep establishing championships with deficit spending and below the participation ratios projected doesn't make sense to the committee.

[Proposal No. 84 (page A-78) was approved by Division III.]

Division III Ice Hockey Championship

Donald M. Russell (Wesleyan University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee and with the support of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded and Proposal No. 85 (pages A-78-79) was approved.]

Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): I move adoption of

Proposal No. 83, which earlier had been withdrawn.

[The motion was seconded.]

Charley Scott (Mississippi State University): I am speaking for Mississippi State University and as a member of the Executive Committee. I am also a member of the program evaluation subcommittee. I am afraid of what we seem to be doing at this particular moment, because these championships will all cost the Association dollars. I do not seem to hear anyone discussing what those dollars are or what the sources of those dollars are. There is a procedure for making these kinds of adjustments that would take into consideration such matters as those. We approved a few minutes ago a deficit championship that does not even meet the criteria that are specified for a championship. I think somebody ought to begin to think about where those monies are coming from because those of us on the Executive Committee somehow will have to fund what you are passing.

P. LaVerne Sweat (Hampton Institute): I rise to speak in favor of Proposal No. 83. Currently, the Association sponsors an indoor track and field championship for both men and women in all three divisions. Although Division II member athletes can compete if they meet the qualification standards, in all reality this is a Division I indoor championship. The high qualifying standards do not allow for any significant participation on the part of Division II athletes. For those of you whose athletes can qualify for this meet, they are frequently unsuccessful in attaining a place in the top six finishers.

Some time ago, a survey was made of the Division II institutions by the Association to determine whether or not 25 percent of the actual members of the division sponsor indoor track on a varsity intercollegiate basis. The survey determined that, indeed, that percentage existed for both men and women as the legislation requires. An indoor track and field championship may, therefore, be established. I feel that the athletes in Division II need their own championship. They need no longer to strive for success in a championship where, for the most part, their level is way below that of the majority of participants. They can be more successful in their own championship. I urge the members of Division II to adopt Proposal No. 83.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): As chair of the NCAA Championships Standards Committee, I am very concerned that the standards that have been developed are being eroded. For example, for comparison purposes, the championship participation ratio for the 1983 NCAA Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships has been provided by the NCAA staff.

If the Division II championships are established, estimated ratios for these events have been developed. For Division II men, we are projecting a one-to-seven ratio and our standard is one-to-16. For women, it is one-to-four. Our standard is one-to-16. So when you add the participation ratios, plus the \$175,000 deficit, there is no reason to really have a Championships Standards Committee if we cannot establish and maintain some type of criteria.

So it is the Association's money, but we are looking at deficit spending and greatly reduced participation ratios assuming the figures that have been provided by the staff are correct. So I would urge a no vote on this in fairness.

Mr. Sweat (Hampton Institute): I contend that the ratio is due to fact that Division II athletes do not have a championship of their own to go to. I feel

the ratios would be considerably better if the Division II athletes had their own championship participation level.

[Proposal No. 83 (page A-78) was approved.]

Division III Football Championship

Edwin D. Muto (State University of New York, Buffalo): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of No. 86 is to specify that a member of Division I or Division II initially classified into Division III football after September 1, 1983, shall not be eligible for the Division III football championship. Proposal No. 86 allows the institutions that have made a commitment to Division III football to remain in the championship.

Wayne Sunderland (C. W. Post University): I would like to speak in opposition to No. 86. It seems to me this proposal flies in the face of the principle of self-determination espoused by the organization, and up to this time available within the rules. My institution has made the decision at the presidential and board level and publicly announced its intention to move from Division II to Division III. This move is based upon legitimate philosophical and economic reasoning and will allow us to compete with nearby institutions which share with us a desire to compete in a conference structure that would work for the benefit of all our football players. This legislation would preclude us from ever competing for a national championship, an objective which ought to be available no matter how unrealistic that possibility.

Our conference affiliation, and possibly the entire conference structure, might be adversely affected if we were to be denied the privilege of competing beyond the local level since we could not represent the conference in postseason competition. Our phased-in transition to Division III and our plan to comply with all Division II regulations poses no threat to potential opponents.

The economic realities of life may well dictate that others seek a similar remedy for their problems. That remedy ought not to force them into second-class citizenship. We think we have committed no crime to be punished, and neither should the student-athlete be deprived. The waiting period mandated in Proposal No. 87 would not be desirable for us, but it would be understandable. Please consider a vote that would not foreclose options for our members in the items in No. 86.

Michael Briglia (Glassboro State College): We, too, are opposed to No. 86. We think it is unfair to Divisions I or II student-athletes who may eventually have to move down to Division III. We would like to see the football schools continue in Division III as long as they follow the rules. We would like the membership to defeat No. 86 and support No. 87.

George P. Malley (University of Santa Clara): I also would like to speak against Proposal No. 86, not necessarily for the members of Division I or Division II who might want to drop to Division III, but for the many small schools throughout the country that are trying to develop interest in the great game of football. They would not be eligible for a championship were they to start the sport.

I think that Proposal No. 87 takes care of the problems that you would

have with a school where football was a scholarship sport in Division I or Division II by making them ineligible for two years for the championship. I think that it is grossly unfair for someone to start the sport of football and never have a chance to excel.

[Proposal No. 86 (page A-79) was defeated by all divisions.]

Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships

Joe Singleton (University of California, Davis): I would like to move to rescind Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

Charley Scott (Mississippi State University): I call to your attention the speech I made a minute ago about the funds that would be necessary for such a championship. I would urge the "blue paddles" to show their indication of what they think about that expenditure.

[The motion to rescind Proposal No. 83 (page A-78) was defeated.]

Division III Football Championship

Edwin D. Muto (State University of New York, Buffalo): On behalf of the Council and the Division III Steering Committee, I move Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow those institutions that have made a commitment to the philosophy of Division III to have a competitive opportunity in the sport of football. It is the committee's opinion that institutions that have been competing in the Division III football championships have often been placed in the position of vying against institutions that have a majority of their program in another division and only intend to remain in Division III for a short period of time.

This proposal would encourage those institutions that presently sponsor football at the Division III level to remain and would ensure that institutions wishing to participate at the Division III level make a commitment to remain in the division for a minimum period of time prior to becoming eligible for the championship. On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, we encourage adoption of Proposal No. 87.

Theodore A. Bick (Union College (New York)): What we would like to do is to make the championship eligible next year only to Union and Augustana so we would have another shot at it. Failing that, which I suspect will not work, I think I understand the intent of this motion. I have no problem with it except for the three-year eligibility period which I would like to see changed either to five years or to a specific statement which says that no athlete who was originally recruited as a football player be eligible to compete in that championship. I suspect at this point my only strategy would be to urge defeat of this proposal in the hope that a similar proposal along the lines I have suggested would be offered next year.

Thomas J. Frericks (University of Dayton): I would like to remind the Division I membership that the part pertaining to Division I was passed at the 1983 Convention as an amendment-to-an-amendment at that time. Therefore, I urge those voting in Division I to consider voting for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 87 (pages A-79-80) was approved by all divisions.]

Seeding for Team Championships

Mary Alice Hill (San Diego State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move approval of the amendment-to-the-amendment, No. 88-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 88-1, strikes the "team sports" generalization and specifies women's basketball and volleyball as the applicable championships. At least 25 percent of the championship field or at least four teams, whichever is greater, shall be seeded and placed in the bracket without regard to geographic location.

During the summer meetings that were held in Denver, the primary women athletics administrators unanimously supported this concept. They felt that we should have the best teams represented at the national championships in the sports of volleyball and basketball. I would urge your support for this amendment.

Elizabeth Murphey (University of Georgia): We feel in our conference that Proposal No. 88 is unnecessary and it is very restrictive. The current executive regulations permit seeding in all championships. Our present permissive regulations give each sports committee the latitude and flexibility to accommodate the needs and growth of the sports they serve. Now, if Proposal No. 88 is passed, which would mandate seeding, sports committees would no longer be able to make adjustments and decisions on what may be best for their sport. It is evident in some sports that geographic qualifying is still needed for development on a national scale. Even our most popular women's sports, which this amendment addresses, would continue to be regional in strength.

For example, basketball could continue to be predominantly strong in the South if this passes; and volleyball could continue to be predominantly strong in the West. Also, the financial implications are important here. This motion does require moving teams around the country a great deal more.

Our women's programs are experiencing quality in growth and great popularity. It is too soon to mandate across the board required seeding without regard to geographic locations. I urge defeat of this amendment and Proposal No. 88.

[Proposal No. 88-1 (page A-80) was defeated.]

Nora Lynn Finch (North Carolina State University): As our delegates are aware, this Association determines its nonrevenue championship bracket sizes by a one-to-eight ratio. There is one participant for every eight teams competing in the division. As the chair of the Division I Women's Basketball Committee, I encourage the delegates to consider the financial ramifications of Proposal No. 88.

The Division I Women's Basketball Championships are on the verge of generating a profit, resulting from an increased television contract for the 1985, 1986 and 1987 tournaments. I would much prefer a potential expansion of the current 32-team bracket than I would to see us increase the seeding to mandate that the sports committee seed eight of the 32 teams. The sports committees currently have the authority to seed four teams, protecting the most likely for financial considerations.

Proposal No. 88 mandates that the Division I Women's Basketball Committee and all sports committees seed for us eight teams without regard

to travel expenses. I think my colleagues and my friends in the media often make a comparison between the Division I Men's and Women's Basketball Championships. Let us not put the cart before the horse. I encourage the delegates to allow our women's basketball championship and the other team championships to grow in prestige and acceptance under the current policy. I encourage that you defeat No. 88.

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): As a member of the Executive Committee, I speak in opposition to the proposal. If this proposal were adopted, it would double, at least, the number of teams we seed without regard to geographic location. This would certainly increase the transportation costs; and it certainly does not sit well with the Executive Committee, which is in conflict with our policy, especially with regard to other sports which are not self-supporting.

Regardless of the merits of the proposal, I would speak against it as a matter of principle. We have policies and procedures for the operation of our championships. Basically, the conduct of our championships is in the hands of the sports committees. The sports committees establish a procedure, including brackets and seeding. These are reviewed every year, subject to the approval of the Championships Standards Committee, which is a sub-committee of the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee itself.

Any questions or suggested changes such as those included here should be brought to the attention of the sports committee. If the organization is proposing a change and is not satisfied with the actions of the sports committee, it can appeal to the Executive Committee. I can assure you that the appeals will be given proper consideration. We hope these procedures will be followed for both men and women's sports and that we do not try to solve these problems on the Convention floor.

[Proposal No. 88 (page A-80) was defeated.]

Automatic Qualification—Division I Men's Basketball

H. George Frederickson (Eastern Washington University): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

Several years ago, this Association adopted a series of bylaws and regulations designed to establish membership in Division I. These bylaws and regulations have been effective. The intent of No. 89 is to permit an established Division I conference currently receiving automatic qualification in men's basketball to add a new member that has been a member of Division I for less than five years and retain the conference's automatic-qualification privilege and to prohibit the new conference member from representing the conference until the institution has been a Division I member for at least three years.

This amendment does not erode the present effectiveness of bylaws and regulations designed to establish limits in Division I but will give some flexibility to conferences if they wish to add a new member. I urge the adoption of No. 89.

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): I rise to express two concerns about No. 89 and, to some degree, about No. 90. It is the intent of the amendment to satisfy a problem of one or two institutions; or, as my colleague Doug Hobbs has pointed out, private membership legislation. I would prefer that the membership adopt procedures to handle individual requests rather

than change policies which may have nonidentifiable long-range negative effects. This concern would apply to any private membership legislation.

Secondly, approximately three years ago these regulations were adopted at the recommendations of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee. The primary purpose was to make migration into Division I more difficult and to require institutions to demonstrate over a satisfactory period of time our commitment to the Division I level of basketball.

I see no signs that these regulations are not working; and, to the contrary, we are enjoying the most successful Division I basketball tournament ever. I would urge the Convention to give the present legislation more time to determine its effectiveness by voting against this amendment. If this legislation is presented for one or two institutions, I would urge the sponsors to present legislation which would provide mechanisms to handle private membership legislation. I could support that.

James Colclough (Monmouth College (New Jersey)): I rise to speak in favor of this amendment. As a new member of Division I, we feel that the present five-year waiting period before we are eligible to join a conference is unfair and not consistent with NCAA regulations. Under the bylaws for division membership, there is a stipulation that whenever an institution changes divisions, that institution shall continue to be classified in that division for a minimum of three years. Since three years is used as the basis for a commitment, it seems only fair that the same three years should be sufficient enough time for that institution to join a conference and become a representative member of that conference. I urge the Division I membership to pass this amendment.

Unidentified Delegate: I ask the proponents of No. 89 to remember that I feel that a present conference in Division I would not take on Division I members who had not been in that conference. To place them in an independent status for five years is placing an unfair financial burden on an institution and is, in fact, servitude. I urge you to vote no on No. 89.

[Proposal No. 89 (page A-81) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 90 (pages A-81-82) was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 91 (page A-82) was withdrawn.]

Resolution — Division I-AA Football

George D. Langdon Jr. (Colgate University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution by Colgate University and five other sponsors places before you a direct concern that all of us at this Convention have — that our student-athletes will have the opportunity to be students first. The present format for play-offs leading to the national football championship in Division I-AA involves 11 games over four consecutive weekends. The teams that reach the championship game play four consecutive games in addition to their regular schedule, three if they draw a first-round bye. That is 14 or 15 football games for teams in Division I-AA playing in the championship.

They play those games on consecutive weekends in the last Saturday in November through the third Saturday in December. That is the time when a great majority of our schools are finishing final examinations. Last summer, I wrote a letter to the presidents and chancellors of colleges which participate in the I-AA play-offs seeking their advice on this present format. The great

majority of those who responded indicated their concern with this present play-off schedule, both because the length of the schedule places an excessive demand on students who play football and also because the schedule conflicts with academic exercises at the end of the semester.

I think it is worth pointing out that Division I has resisted football play-offs for years. One of the reasons that is cited by Division I-A coaches and presidents is the conflict that creates problems in Division I-AA. Resolution No. 92 asks the NCAA to give careful consideration to revising the Division I-AA play-offs with a new format and a calendar that will begin in January 1986. This date recognizes the existing television contract and does not conflict with it. This resolution does not specify any particular change, but it asks for a review. Implicit in this resolution is a new format to reduce conflicts with academic calendars and minimize postseason demands on our athletes. Many of us, Mr. Chairman, believe that the present schedule for the Division I-AA play-offs comes dangerously close to compromising the academic interests of many of our students. There must be a better way to determine a national football champion in our division, a way that says we are interested first and foremost in the general and educational welfare of our students. This resolution simply asks that we try to find that better way. I ask the membership of Division I-AA to support this resolution.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): I represent an institution which was fortunate enough to get through the semifinals in the recent NCAA play-offs. We did have to make some adjustments in our exam schedules and that sort of thing, but we were happy to do so. We would have been very glad to have gone to the final game but we did not get there. We do not feel there is anything wrong with the present system of play-offs, or that there is an obvious way to improve it.

So we see that there is no particular need for study at this time. We would oppose this resolution.

M. Maceo Nance Jr. (South Carolina State College): As one of the sponsors of the resolution, we, too, have been privileged to participate in the Division I-AA play-offs. And I am inclined to agree with the maker and presenter of this resolution that it is in keeping with the integrity of this organization and its concern about academic performance and academic integrity. I merely wish to reemphasize that we are not suggesting in this resolution that I-AA play-offs be discontinued, but at this point in time we are not in a position to accept that there is not a better way.

We are merely asking this organization as it anticipates such play-offs in other divisions to look at the whole format again in terms of the scheduling of play-offs so that it would minimize the effect that such play-offs would have on our academic programs. I can tell you that adjustments have to be made, and sometimes they have a devastating effect on other academic programs. We urge the support of this resolution.

Luna I. Mishoe (Delaware State College): We should do all we can at all times in the interest of academic excellence with our students, and this is a reasonable request. I urge support of No. 92.

Andrew T. Mooradian (University of New Hampshire): On behalf of the Division I-AA Football Committee, I would like to speak in opposition to this resolution. The Division I-AA Football Committee continues to look at the academic implications of championships. We continue to look at what is best for the membership. During the past two years since we have established

the Division I-AA football championships we have had comments from most presidents that have taken part in the championships. All of them feel it is worthwhile; all of them had to make adjustments in their final exams if they conflicted. The Division I-AA Committee at its May meeting will continue to look at ways to improve the play-offs; but from the tone of this resolution, the tone is to cut back the number that participate. I think this will be very unfair to the Division I-AA Committee to have to cut back without studying it, looking at it and getting input from all members of Division I-AA. I urge defeat of this resolution.

Albert Somit (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): We went through the play-offs reasonably successfully. I do not think that the sponsors of this resolution have any specific solution in mind. Certainly, I did not have in mind the idea that we would reduce the number of participants in the play-offs. It is a troublesome arrangement, and I think the only motivation we have here is to request the matter be looked at without suggesting any specific solution. I urge that given the current situation and the fact that the four-game play-off sets up the latter part of November and almost all of December, I would ask the NCAA be willing to look once again at possible alternative.

[Proposal No. 92 (pages A-82-83) was defeated by Division I-AA.]

Resolution: Division I Men's Ice Hockey

Paul J. Olscamp (Bowling Green State University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the sponsoring conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

Because the present distributions have assured at-large championship bids, one of the three major men's ice hockey conferences has only about one-half the chance of the other two to be represented in the national championship. Yet the affected conference, the Central Collegiate Hockey Association, is truly competitive with the other two.

This year, for example, the CCHA record against other conferences is 30-22-2. Surely that deserves an equal chance. Ice hockey is now approaching the stature of a national sport. The current method of selecting to produce a national play-off can result in one conference having six of the final eight teams, with only one from each of the others. In light of the very comparable performance of the three conferences, this, too, seems unfair.

The current method of selection permits an outstanding team in any conference to win its conference championship in a definitive, even overwhelming manner, but lose its postseason tournament in the final game by a single goal and be excluded from the national play-offs in favor of a team with a much poorer record from another conference. This, in fact, did happen last year; and it caused a national scandal in intercollegiate hockey and undermined the confidence in the NCAA governance of the sport.

No matter what team is affected and no matter what conference, that, too, seems unfair. Proposal No. 93 does not make it impossible for this to happen again, but it does make it less likely and it is, therefore, a step toward fairness and equity. Ice hockey is the only sport with a Division I championship that produces income for the NCAA with such a small number of participating schools.

I believe that no other sport draws its national championship competition from only three conferences. These small numbers make equality of access to

the NCAA championships even more important, and in this respect ice hockey is unique. It is very important to be aware that No. 93 takes nothing away from anyone. The Eastern College Athletic Conference hockey schools gain an at-large bid, as do the Western College Hockey Association and the CCHA.

Anticipated conference and affiliation changes in the East and West do not change the additional fairness resulting from No. 93. It does not lessen the chances for any independent, such as the Air Force Academy or the University of Northern Arizona, for example, to make the national playoffs. It does not affect the addition or transfer of teams to or from conferences nor the creation of any conferences. It leaves the final choice of at-large bids in the hands of the NCAA Men's Ice Hockey Committee.

It does make the chances for all teams to participate in the national championship more equal. They would still, of course, have to win their conference and/or tournament title. It does make a repetition of last year's unacceptable situation less likely. Since it harms no one and increases fairness, it deserves your support. Since the issue of fairness is an issue for all and because none of the 39 sponsoring Division I ice hockey schools are ineligible to vote, I believe it is important for all eligible institutions to vote and not simply ice hockey institutions. I hope you will support No. 93.

Hugh D. Hindman (Ohio State University): The Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship is emerging as one of the outstanding events sponsored by this Association, both in revenue and fan interest. With the realignment of leagues, East, Central and West, there has also been a realignment of strength within these leagues. I would like to remind the institutions without ice hockey programs that this resolution does not cost a penny, nor does it put you at a disadvantage competitively. It simply provides the best possible field for one of the outstanding championships that we sponsor today.

John B. Simpson (Boston University): I rise to speak in opposition to the resolution on one major issue. In the 1985 championship year, there will be four Division I conferences. The ECAC will be divided into two championships. I remind the membership that 19 schools are involved, almost 50 percent of all the schools which play Division I men's ice hockey.

I also would like to call to the attention of the delegates a letter that was written to you, Mr. President, John L. Toner, from Louis A. Lamoriello of the new proposed Eastern conference, which is set to begin play in 1985, in which he has requested through you and the Men's Ice Hockey Committee an automatic bid for 1985, for the new emerging conference. Also noted in his letter was that in eight of the last 10 years the Eastern NCAA automatic qualifier came out of this new league. This would have been on the floor by the NCAA Men's Ice Hockey Committee but for the unfortunate passing of Ralph Romano, chair of that committee. Because of the formation of the new conference for 1984-85, someone in the East would be disenfranchised; and I would urge defeat of this resolution.

Marvin L. Kumlner (Bowling Green State University): In response to the previous speaker, I would like to quote from the executive regulations of the NCAA. The executive regulations provide that the governing sports committee may recommend annually to the Executive Committee those conferences which should receive automatic qualification for their teams or individual student-athletes into the NCAA meets or tournaments.

Now, Section 6-(b)-(2) states that each such conference must be an allied member of the Association for two consecutive academic years and have conducted competition in the sport in question for two consecutive years at the time of its application for automatic qualification. I would submit that the formation of a new league next year does not alter the merit of equity and fairness in this national sport. I think the traditions of the NCAA notwithstanding, the issue of fairness nationally to our student-athletes is our paramount concern.

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal. Although I have some problems with the merits of the proposal, basically I am again speaking against this motion on a matter of principle and policy. The sponsor should take the request to the sports committee and if not satisfied, then to the Executive Committee. This is where the action should be and not here where we have such a crowded agenda and insufficient time. I urge you to defeat this proposal and suggest the sponsors follow the procedure I outlined.

[Proposal No. 93 (pages A-83-84) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 94 (page A-84) was withdrawn.] [Proposal No. 95 (page A-84-85) was withdrawn.]

Recruiting Contacts

Charles S. Harris (University of Pennsylvania): Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, the Ivy Group withdraws Proposal Nos. 94 and 95, but respectfully moves adoption of Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

Inasmuch as the eight members of the Ivy League do not offer athletic scholarships, do not participate in a letter-of-intent program, and continually rely on representatives of the admissions office for the enrolling of all students, we, therefore, request that this body provide the Council with the authority to waive the existing provisions for institutions that do not award financial aid based on athletic ability. The intent is clearly to provide the Council with the opportunity to review the Ivy League's special request.

[Proposal No. 96 (page A-85) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Collegiate Commissioners Association, the intent of Proposal No. 97 is to establish a quiet period 48 hours prior to and 36 hours after the initial date on which a prospective student-athlete may sign a National Letter of Intent. The purpose is for the student-athlete and his family to reflect and have family counsel prior to the signing date without undue pressure from college coaches.

There should be no campus or off-campus in-person face-to-face contacts by institutional staff members or representatives of the athletic interests during this time period. In football, for example, this year, the signing date is February 8. So the quiet period would run from Monday, February 6, up to noon on Friday, February 10. This would not prevent any coaches from calling or sending mail or anything of that type.

In all other sports, the signing date is April 11, so the quiet period would run from April 9 to Friday, April 13. The effective date is immediately, which means that you would be available in February; and after that time frame or quiet period has expired the no-contact provision is off.

C. Arnold Ferrin Jr. (University of Utah): I would like to move that the two issues in the proposal be separated in order to vote separately on the quiet period associated with the National Letter of Intent and the eliminating of the initial paid visits during the National Association of Basketball Coaches Convention noted in Subparagraph 6-(ii) in Proposal No. 97.

President Toner: If there is no objection, that will be in order. To help you out, if you will just draw a line at the end of Subparagraph 6-(i) and beginning at 6-(ii), we will vote separately on everything above that line, and then everything below that line.

Glenn Schembechler (University of Michigan): Mr. President, I am president of the American Football Coaches Association. We respectfully propose that we not pass this legislation since our organization has not had an opportunity to study this proposal or to poll our membership as to whether we would like to have it or not. Those of us who have been involved in the quiet period in the past have not had any inclination whatsoever to reinstate the quiet period because we see no purpose for it at this time. We will promise the NCAA Council that we will study it and that we will poll our membership and get back to them if we think it is an issue that ought to be passed by this Convention. At the present time, on behalf of our organization, we are not interested in a quiet period of just prior to and after the initial signing date.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I would like to reiterate what Bo has said. Personally, I agree with the philosophy of the quiet period. I think the boys should have a right to pick the right school and for the right reason. However, there are two things that bother me about this particular regulation at this particular time.

Number one, obviously, is the fact that we have had so little time to discuss the implications of it. When we have had quiet periods, we have not had the limitations on grants, which is a very difficult thing to adjust to even when you are pretty sure that the kid is going to make a decision. Now you are dealing with maybe 23 or 24 grants, and we would like to get all of them if we can. Now you are in the situation where you are not allowed to make contact with the youngster when he might be in a dilemma as to whether he is going to come or not. That is one thing that bothers me.

Another thing that bothers me is the fact that the legislation would become effective immediately. Today is January 11, and we would not be able to visit a youngster until after February 5, which means we only have 3 1/2 weeks right now to adjust our procedure—the kind of letters we would put out, the kind of visits we would make. It would also mean that the weekend of February 4-5, which is the last weekend prior to the signing date, we would have some prospects on our campus. They would go home and some of our opponents who were recruiting the youngsters and institutions where the youngster might have some interest would not have an opportunity to sit and visit with him after he has come back from our visit, and vice versa with us. I do not think that is particularly fair. I think sometimes the kid comes back from a visit and he has his head in the air, and he has not had a chance to settle down and have some other people talk to him. I think for those reasons

I would hope maybe we could postpone this legislation until next year, because I think it is very worthy of consideration.

I think philosophically it is something that appeals to me very much, but I am a little bit nervous that we are not quite sure what we are doing right now because of time constraints.

Joseph Vancisin (National Association of Basketball Coaches): The second part of this proposal is noncontroversial. The off-campus recruiting contacts already are prohibited in basketball during the quiet period of the NABC Convention. Proposal No. 97 would also prohibit on-campus recruiting. In Proposal No. 103, the football coaches are making the same request that both on-campus and off-campus recruiting be prohibited during this quiet period. We ask your support on this issue.

President Toner: I will remind the membership although it is not listed, the intent here is that this vote would be for men's basketball. There will be similar legislation affecting women's basketball coming up. This is a men's basketball only issue.

[Proposal No. 97 (pages A-85-86) was approved in part. The portion applying to a "quiet period" surrounding the National Letter of Intent signing rate was defeated by Division I (136-136, tie vote fails) and Division II. The portion applying to the Division I Men's Basketball Championship was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Employment of High School Coach

Anthony J. Diekema (Calvin College): On behalf of the Divisions II and III Steering Committees, I move adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow member colleges the opportunity to employ as members of the athletic staff those individuals who presently hold positions in local high schools, junior or community colleges. Many times, Division II and Division III institutions have not had the ability to hire full-time coaches in all sports. This is particularly true in those sports which require a number of assistants. Proposal No. 98 would allow individuals to serve on the college staff while continuing their employment with either a high school or junior college. In summary, the proposal would provide opportunities for Division II and Division III to maintain a strong college staff with qualified individuals from their local communities.

Theodore A. Bick (Union College (New York)): I want to urge the delegates in Divisions II and III to vote against Proposal No. 98. I do this in full recognition of the necessity some of my colleagues feel that they have to hire secondary school coaches and coaches in colleges and universities. At the present time, these colleagues employ such coaches in good faith; and presumably defeat of this motion will allow them to continue to do so under whatever device they now use.

But No. 98 brings to the attention of even a faculty representative the existence of a large loophole. Indeed, the legislative services staff tells me that under existing legislation, continuing under this mandate, it would be possible for an unscrupulous college or university coach to hire an unscrupulous secondary school coach for the specific, if diffused, purpose of recruiting a member of members of that coach's squad.

We are protected, I am told, by the intention of the NCAA Council to interpret this amendment and similar existing legislation in such a way as to

avoid that practice and similar practices. If indeed that is the intention, then I would urge the Council to employ its considerable ability to draft a proposal which does not rely on intention but is specifically designed to avoid at least these obvious and pusillanimous abuses. For that purpose, I urge the delegates to defeat this.

Michael Briglia (Glassboro State College): We, in Division III, definitely would like the support of the delegation for this proposal. In our case, it affects us a great deal in the sport of gymnastics. In the state of New Jersey, gymnastics is a fall high school sport; and in the collegiate institutions it is a winter sport. Without the support of this delegation, we have one choice when we go back. We either drop gymnastics or we will not participate in the NCAA.

Trying to find a competent person to coach in the field of gymnastics is not very easy. We ask your support and think that in terms of the interpretation that the NCAA would make to each of the cases that it would be perhaps positive rather than unscrupulous.

Donald M. Russell (Wesleyan University): We support a program of 25 intercollegiate sports. We would like to have the opportunity to hire qualified people who happen to be coaching in this high school level. I think that the gentleman from Union College, if he attended the Division II round table, might have made his views known then and we might have been able to discuss it more fully at that time and not burden the Convention with this at this time.

Gail H. Davis (Rhode Island College): I would like to echo the sentiments of my colleagues from Glassboro State and Wesleyan University. Divisions II and III very much need this proposal to augment their coaching staffs with good people, not unscrupulous people, directed by good administrators.

[Proposal No. 98 (pages A-86-87) was approved by Divisions II and III.]

[Proposal No. 99 (page A-87) was withdrawn.]

Recruiting Contact and Evaluation Periods—Basketball

Richard G. Shrider (Miami University (Ohio)): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council and Divisions I and II Steering Committees, I move adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to eliminate the October 10-31 time period from the contact period, and add a June 15-30 time period to the evaluation period of the sport of basketball for Divisions I and II. Actually, there would be less contact with this proposal. We met with the NABC this summer, and they favor this proposal. It is not controversial, and I urge support of this proposal.

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): I would like to request the voting on this amendment be divided. The passage of Part B is essential to recruiting in those states that have a nontraditional girl's basketball season, and I prefer not to see it tied to an issue which is not in that category. It does not specifically affect those states.

President Toner: If there is no objection, we will divide Parts A and B.

Jack R. Wentworth (Indiana University, Bloomington): Coach Bob Knight of Indiana University is the chairperson of the Legislative Committee of the National Association of Basketball Coaches, and like nearly all

basketball coaches cannot be here for the Convention. He tried to get here, but Ralph Floyd, in view of his record, said he should be home coaching. (Laughter.) Although I cannot match his style or eloquence, I will try to indicate the support that the coaches have for this legislation. It was proposed and submitted by the NABC and passed nearly unanimously there. And, of course, it was endorsed by the Council. I urge its passage.

Ms. Koenig: At the present time, there are states with nontraditional high school girl's basketball seasons. Fall basketball is played in Michigan, Montana, Nevada, North and South Dakota, West Virginia and some parts of Pennsylvania and Virginia. With the existing evaluation dates, coaches could not watch high school games between August 2 and November 30, a ridiculous situation at best since all games except for the final states of the state high school tournaments are played between those dates. I urge adoption of Part B to permit evaluation between the initial and final dates of the high school athletes' basketball season which covers both those that play in the winter and those that play in a nontraditional season.

[Proposal No. 100 (page A-88) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting Contact and Evaluation Periods—Women's Basketball

Jean Cerra-Decker (University of Missouri, Columbia): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would apply to recruiting restrictions for contact and evaluation to prospective women basketball players effective August 1, 1984. Although there have been a number of NCAA rules that have been modified for the women's programs during the transition period, the Council and the Division I Steering Committee, after receiving encouragement from many women's basketball coaches, felt it would be in the best interest of women's basketball and its recruits to have recruiting rules in this area be consistent.

This change would eliminate much of the confusion surrounding the recruitment of prospective female student-athletes by requiring a high school or junior college administrator to be familiar with only one set of dates governing contact and evaluation periods for all eligible high school or junior college basketball players.

Another point in support of this amendment relates to the fact that the application of the current rule requires members of the women's basketball coaching staffs of colleges and universities to be involved in the recruiting process year-round although most of our institutions have fewer number of coaches involved in women's basketball, thereby spreading them thin over a longer period of time.

Also, it is difficult for the smaller recruiting budgets of the women's basketball staffs to support an intense 12-month recruitment process. Although we are aware that approximately five states have high school girls' basketball seasons that are distinctively different from what is viewed as the traditional November to March season, this change would not disadvantage the college coaches and prospective athletes in those states because all coaches recruiting athletes in those states would be subject to the same restrictions.

Also, the women's collegiate season in those states falls into the traditional basketball season time frame; and thus the change would actually improve

the availability of what is already a limited women's basketball coaching staff to devote to working on campus with our collegiate teams. It was the opinion of the Division I Steering Committee that the stated advantages were significant enough to propose ending one year in advance the waiver section provided for women's basketball in this bylaw; and, therefore, I encourage the adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 101 (pages A-88-89) was approved by Division I.]

Women's Basketball Recruiting Season

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): Mr. Chairman, I am moving adoption of No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

I want to speak in behalf of Nora Lynn Finch who temporarily had to leave the room. I want to read her statement: "On behalf of the basketball coaches association and the NCAA Council, I would encourage adoption of Proposal No. 102. This proposal would provide for a quiet period to surround the Division I Women's Basketball Championship and the annual meeting of the Women's Basketball Coaches Association, thus allowing coaches to attend the convention and to be present at the Division I championship without being concerned for the lack of time for recruiting women's basketball players."

Betty Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): Because of the importance the coaches association places on its annual convention, which is held in conjunction with the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Championship, and because of the professional exchanges, committee meetings, awards presentations and teaching clinics held during our Convention, the coaches of Division I women's basketball seek a quiet period of recruitment both on- and off-campus in order that our coaches have the opportunity to attend the convention without concerns of recruiting. The WBCA asks the Division I delegates of the NCAA Convention to pass Proposal No. 102.

[Proposal No. 102 (page A-84) was approved by Division I.]

Football Recruiting Season

David L. Maggard (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal comes as a recommendation from the football coaches association. It is straightforward and noncontroversial. This simply establishes a noncontact period on- or off-campus during the time of the football coaches convention to encourage the coaches to attend the convention without being disadvantaged in recruiting. I might mention the effective date on this would be for the 1985 Convention. I urge your adoption of Proposal No. 103.

Glenn Schembechler (University of Michigan): Our coaches have felt for a long time that with a moratorium on recruiting we would have greater participation in our annual convention and thus become a more viable organization. This is technically true with our assistant coaches committee, which has come before us on several occasions saying they want a moratorium on recruiting so that more of them can attend the Convention. I do not think this is a really controversial issue of any kind, and I urge the

passage of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 103 (pages A-89-90) was approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA.]

Football Evaluation Periods

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): I would like to move adoption of No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

One of the concerns that I think has been expressed which motivated this legislation is that it would provide the opportunity for coaches to be on campus and take care of some of the young men they have already recruited. The coaches could make sure the student-athletes are in proper condition in terms of their academic deportment and to stay with their families for awhile in the spring, which is not something they get the opportunity to do very often nowadays.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): Let me just quickly make some historical references as to why we have the evaluation date in May. When the recruiting calendar was put together, it included certain concessions that had to be made by various groups throughout the country. The people who made the most significant concessions were the people in the Southeastern Conference, who were willing to change their early signing date to go to one signing date across the country. At that time, they felt it was very important that they be able to evaluate in the month of May, since there is so much spring practice in their area of the country. And as a compromise, we agreed to allow evaluation in May and they would go along with the later signing date and a single signing date. I think in all fairness to those people who acted in good faith, we ought to make sure when putting the recruiting calendar together that we do that.

The other thing is, I really do not know if we will save any money if we eliminate May evaluation. May evaluation is not of any particular importance to the area in the Northeast, but I do think in some ways it will save us money if we are allowed to go out and look at films of kids and talk to coaches. In that sense, you eliminate literally hundreds of people from your list, which means that you cut down your mailing lists, your recruiting propaganda, your telephone calls.

So, I do not know what the elimination of the month of May for evaluation really does, because it may not save us as much money as I think some people would indicate. I think we really have some kind of moral commitment to the Southeastern Conference that we do not back down at this time.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): For all of the reasons that Coach Paterno has listed, plus one major additional one that I think this Convention needs to be aware of, I urge that we defeat this proposal. As we move forward to Proposal No. 48 and need a greater amount of evaluation of these student-athletes not only athletically but academically, it will be of primary importance that we have this evaluation period during the spring to thoroughly evaluate these people not only athletically but also academically.

Jerry D. Claiborne (University of Kentucky): I also would like to reiterate what Mr. Kramer and Coach Paterno said, plus the fact that I think that a lot of schools are through in the month of April. The last day of class at the University of Kentucky is April 30 this year. So, therefore, the academic year

for our players is over. This is a great time for our coaches to get out, go to high schools, look at films, evaluate the upcoming seniors and get an opportunity to know exactly who we are going to want to recruit.

As I say, in our area they do have spring practice. In our present rule, if anyone does not feel they are getting anything from the evaluation of the month of May, our present rule does not say you have to evaluate during the month, it just says that you can. If you do not like to and do not get anything out of it, you do not have to leave your campus. We would like you vote down this proposal.

[Proposal No. 104 (page A-90) was defeated by Divisions I-A, I-AA, and II football-playing members.]

Complimentary Admissions

William H. Baughn (University of Colorado): I move adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not an earth-shaking amendment, but one of simple equity involving two schools that have a situation where they play traditional games in the same city year after year, with one acting as the home team in alternate years. The present regulation will permit one of the teams to provide this limited complimentary-ticket situation, but because of the state line the other team cannot do so. The schools may be equal distance from the site, but this particular provision in the regulations creates and inequity and we ask you to help remedy this.

[Proposal No. 105 (pages A-90-91) was approved by all divisions (Division I vote 138-114).]

[Proposal No. 106 (page A-91) was withdrawn.]

Complimentary Meal

John C. Parry (Brown University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 107 (pages A-91-92) was approved by Division I-AA, 41-39. The proposal subsequently was reconsidered and defeated by Division I-AA, 38-49. See discussion following Proposal No. 117.]

Recruiting Contact—All-Star Game

Olav B. Kollevoll (Lafayette College): On behalf of the NCAA Eligibility Committee, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to prohibit an in-person contact outside of the permissible contact periods with prospective student-athletes in the sports of football and basketball at the site of practice or competition for a high school all-star game by members of the coaching staff of the member institution on or off its campus. In the past, some institutions have gained an unfair recruiting advantage as a result of unlimited contacts at the site of the all-star practices or games on their campuses outside the permissible contact periods. The committee urges adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 108 (page A-92) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Division I Criteria

Alyce Cheska (University of Illinois, Champaign): I wish to move adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

With the support of the NCAA Council and the support of the committee on women's interests, we wish to present this proposal concerning the criteria for Division I membership, which in part is based on a minimum of eight varsity sports for women at institutions sponsoring women's sports. This would bring the Division I institutions that sponsor women's sports to a minimum number of eight sports for both women and men by September 1, 1988. The graduated plan would include a minimum of six by September 1, 1986; seven by 1987, and eight by 1988. This plan is both feasible and obtainable. In fact, the Division I average this year for sponsored sports for women is about seven sports. An institution seeking an exception to this criterion would be able to petition the NCAA Council for consideration by providing the following information: First, by demonstrating that the ratio of male to female students would be prohibitive in offering the required number of sports.

Second, by providing information that demonstrates there is insufficient interest among the students in establishing or maintaining the required number of sports.

So, we would like to urge passage of this proposal. One major reason for passing this is that by 1985, as we all know, the NCAA rules and regulations apply across the board to women as well as men. Therefore, it seems only logical that the requirements for participation should be the same for women as for men.

John Brazil (San Jose State University): Mr. President, in view of the hour, I will be brief. Please do not confuse my brevity with lack of conviction that this is an important issue or that more could not have been said on its behalf. Proposal No. 109 is well-drawn and will accomplish its ends. Its ends are good. It will promote equity between men's and women's intercollegiate athletic programs by raising gradually the number of women's sports sponsored by the Division I institutions to equal the number of men's sports required for Division I membership.

Proposal No. 109 will help ensure commitment to broadly based intercollegiate athletic programs among women's Division I institutions. Such comparable commitments will, I am sure, promote competitive balance within that division. Perhaps most importantly, No. 109 will help assure women a range of choices among sports equal to the range of choices men now enjoy. It establishes a reasonable phase-in period, it establishes reasonable procedures for requesting waivers from its requirements and it does not prescribe specific sports. So, each institution may chart its own course according to its own admissions. For these reasons and in the name of competitive balance and equal opportunities in athletics for women, I urge support of No. 109.

Eve Atkinson (Hofstra University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee on Women's Interests, I urge your support for Proposal No. 109. The NCAA membership at the 1981 Convention adopted governance legislation that incorporated women's sports programs into the NCAA.

As we have noted in this Convention, there has been a great deal of block voting in the subclassifications of Division I. Now, in the spirit of today's Convention, a spirit of compromise and betterment of the Association, I urge your support. This proposal attempts to equalize the women's teams

that compete within Division I. The average number of sports offered in Division I for this present year is 8.3 sports. This is a wise proposal which will truly incorporate opportunities for women's athletic programs within the NCAA structure. The flexibility of this program with the phase-in period and waiver process has been explained and has great merit. This proposal does not affect the Division I men's classification. As in Proposal No. 50, the Pell Grant proposal, this legislation is one of the few proposals that has come to this Convention floor that directly shows true concern and opportunity for our student-athletes.

John Moore (Old Dominion University): I rise to support Proposal No. 109. As the previous speakers have indicated, two years ago this body assumed in good faith responsibility for women's athletics and all the commitments that go with that responsibility. At this point, we have made significant progress. Women participate in our governance system. We have a full range of tournament play for women. Our next responsibility is to guarantee that we have a full range of programs, that we have minimum criteria to ensure that full range of intercollegiate opportunity for women's athletics.

We are aware of the many practical concerns that exist on campuses regarding this issue. Most of those concerns focus around costs. We also know that there are many good and just things that cost money. A full range of intercollegiate programs for women athletes on our campuses are of great importance to intercollegiate athletics. The professional, legal and moral responsibilities which we have far override these practical concerns.

We have dealt with much important business at this conference, but it would be most unfortunate if we left failing to pass No. 109 to reflect our sincere commitment to equal opportunity for women. I hope that you will support this legislation.

Christine Grant (University of Iowa): I, too, rise to speak in support of this proposition, which I see as a most reasonable proposal giving ample time for institutions to apply and ample opportunity for any institution to seek a legitimate exception. I think it is most important for this Convention to make a clear statement that it has a genuine commitment to broadly based programs for women as well as men and a strong belief in equal opportunity for all students. I would be heartening, indeed, to have a unanimous consent on this very, very important piece of legislation.

Stanley E. McCaffrey (University of Pacific): I certainly support the philosophy of women's intercollegiate athletics and equal opportunity. However, I rise to speak in opposition to No. 109 for financial reasons. The provision in this proposal makes a commitment for four years hence, to have eight women's sports.

In independent and private colleges and universities, this is a time of declining enrollment. All projections are that enrollments will continue to decline well beyond 1988. Declining enrollment in independent institutions mean lower income, which means more restricted budgets, and limitations in academic programs and personnel. These are the facts of life. This is not some theory. These are going to happen.

Almost every moderate-sized independent institution must face these realities. As president of an institution of this kind, we have responsibility for the financial aspects. Therefore, for the financial reasons only, we would strongly oppose No. 109. Now, you might say there is provision for an

exception to be made, but there is no provision for an exception to be made for financial reasons.

I think it is of the utmost importance that all persons, but especially those in independent institutions in Division I, consider the implications of this proposal. While supporting the philosophy of equal opportunity for women athletes, I believe it is most unwise in these times of critical financial problems to commit increased expenditures in certain fields for years hence when we know we will have to make reductions in academic personnel.

[Proposal No. 109 (pages A-92-94) was approved by Division I, 141-126.]

[Proposal No. 110 (page A-94) was withdrawn.]

Resolution: Drug Testing

Richard H. Perry (University of Southern California): I respectfully move to reorder the agenda to consider at this time Proposal No. 163, a resolution on drug testing.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of No. 163.

[The motion was seconded.]

It seems evident to me, given the epidemic proportions of drug utilization in sports today and the incredible amount of negative publicity that we are receiving, that it is appropriate that this resolution be passed. It does nothing more than to direct the Executive Committee to develop an ongoing program for drug testing and to notify the membership prior to July 1, 1984, of the substances and the nature of that program and present legislation to us to consider at the 1985 Convention.

[Proposal No. 163 (pages A-107-108) was approved.]

Division II Criteria

Janice L. McConnell (California University of Pennsylvania): Representing the sponsoring institutions, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 111 and its amendment, No. 111-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment-to-the-amendment serves as a clarification and refers to single-sex institutions. We believe this proposal is consistent with the Division II philosophy which believes in offering a maximum opportunity for intercollegiate participation to as many of its students as possible, both men and women. We urge the adoption.

[Proposal No. 111-1 (page A-96) was approved by Division II.]

Judith M. Brame (California State University, Northridge): At the Division II round table on Monday, the member institutions were informed that Proposal No. 110 would be withdrawn and No. 111 would be supported and endorsed by the Steering Committee. For this current year, 1983-84, the average number of women's sports offered in Division II is 6.2. With an implementation date of 1987-88, the time frame to meet the proposed six-sport criterion seems reasonable; and this amendment is consistent with the Division II philosophy.

On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee and with the support of the Council, I urge your adoption of No. 111.

Elwood N. Shields (Northeast-Eight Conference): Mr. President, on behalf of all of the institutions in the Northeast-Eight Conference, which

endorse the Division II philosophy of broad-based programs for both sexes and all our students, I urge support of this proposal.

J. Robert Cockrum (Kentucky Wesleyan College): I have been asked to speak for Richard Scharf, commissioner of the Great Lakes Valley Conference, who is now recovering from open-heart surgery and cannot be at the Convention. I would like to ask you to remember him in your prayers and thoughts. For the Great Lakes Valley Conference, I would like to speak against this amendment. The Division II schools, many of whom have 800 to 900 students, are finding it financially difficult to sponsor more and more sports. Many of the Division II schools are dropping out and moving in another association. For financial limitations, we would ask for the defeat of No. 111.

[Proposal No. 111 (pages A-95-96) was approved by Division II as amended by No. 111-1.]

Resolution: Football Television

Hugh D. Hindman (Ohio State University): Because of its importance, I would request moving the order so we can consider Resolution No. 164 at this point in time.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

As chair of the Football Television Committee and on behalf of the committee and the Council, I move approval of Resolution No. 164.

[The motion was seconded.]

In July, the Divisions I-A and I-AA membership overwhelmingly approved a referendum authorizing the Division I Steering Committee to call special meetings of those divisions to discuss football television issues any time prior to the start of the annual Convention. The intent at that time was to authorize a forum to discuss the television issue had the Supreme Court refused to hear the challenge of legality by the NCAA.

Legal counsel believes the Supreme Court will hear this challenge sometime in February. This resolution extends the authorization for the Division I Steering Committee to call special meetings for Divisions I-A and I-AA to discuss football television issues until the Supreme Court has reviewed the current litigation. This resolution does not preclude any institution, any conference or collection of institutions from continuing with any contingency television plans for the 1984 television season.

We would like to reemphasize this. It does not preclude any institution, any conference or collection of institutions from continuing with any contingency television plans for the 1984 season. In fact, the NCAA Football Television Committee is meeting after this Convention adjourns to continue its review of possible amendments to the television plan that would open Saturday night for institutional and conference television programming. The NCAA Football Television Committee believes that the Divisions I-A and I-AA membership should review future television options in an orderly manner after the Supreme Court reviews the current case, and adoption of this resolution would permit each division to address these important issues in an open forum available to each institution. The committee urges you to support this resolution.

William Carr (University of Florida): I would like to speak in favor of this resolution because I believe it is in the best interest of college football television.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): I rise to speak in favor of the resolution. As chairman of the Ad Hoc Television Committee that was approved by mail referendum resolution earlier this year, we feel that we can continue our work on a contingency planning basis. We think that all of these ought to be working on behalf of college football television in the future, so please vote for this resolution.

[Proposal No. 164 (pages A-108-109) was approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA.]

[Proposal No. 112 (pages A-96-97) was withdrawn.]

Membership Effective Date

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): On behalf of the Council, I wish to move adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 113 (pages A-97-99) was approved by all divisions.]

Amateurism—Name or Picture

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. President, on behalf of the 30 cosponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

In order to be very brief, there are three reasons for you to vote for this proposal. First, it would legalize existing practices. Second, it removes a double standard; and third, it would correctly apply the amateur status standards to the Association.

[Proposal No. 114 (pages A-99-100) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 115 (page A-100) was withdrawn. The proposal subsequently was approved. See discussion following Proposal No. 119.]

[Proposal No. 116 (pages A-100-101) was withdrawn.]

Permissible Expenses—World University Games

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): On behalf of the sponsoring institutions, I would like to move adoption of No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would just like to clarify that this is only to enable our institutions to pay for our athletes who have been selected to attend the qualifying events as we do for the Pan American Games and the Olympics. This will allow the institution to pay for the athletes to attend the World University Games. I feel we need to pass this because 90 percent of the athletes who compete at the World University Games come from our institutions. Also, the World University Games have gained a great deal of stature equal to the Pan American Games.

David L. Maggard (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Council, I speak to oppose this proposal. I believe this proposal is too broad. What is qualifying competition and what does it include? Proposal No. 117 may create an additional burden on many of our already strained budgets. Our institutions need not take on this new financial obligation. This is more appropriately left to our Olympic Committee and the national governing bodies administering and funding international competitions at the present time. I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): This is probably the first time I will be differing with my good friend, the president of the Amateur Basketball

Association of the United States of America, the governing body for international basketball. We urge the support of this proposition. The World University Games serves both as motivation and as a means of some sports to qualify for Pan American Olympic Games.

To deny us the opportunity to defray the cost of the expenses incurred is most unfair to our student-athletes and not in keeping with recognizing world-class accomplishment. I remind this august body I think it is permissible legislation. We urge adoption of No. 117.

Nicholas Rodis (Brandeis University): I have been involved in the World University Games since their inception in the 1960s, and I see this as a plus for the school community. There is no reason in the world, in my opinion, why the school community should not support school matters. I urge that you support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 117 (page A-101) was approved.]

Complimentary Meal

Richard M. Trachok (University of Nevada, Reno): Mr. President, I move reconsideration of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to that issue and urge the athletic directors to vote for this proposal. It would permit a Division I-AA institution to provide a complimentary meal in its on-campus dining facilities to a football prospect visiting the campus at the prospect's own expense, without the visit being considered an expense-paid visit. I would urge they consider the impact of that kind of action on their own campus. Also, I think there is some impropriety of being totally different than Division I-A on this matter.

John C. Parry (Brown University): I would beg to differ with the last speaker. There are no limitations on visits in all the sports with the exception of basketball. That particular problem is nonexistent.

[Proposal No. 107 (pages A-91-92) was defeated by Division I-AA, 38-49.]

Permissible Expenses—Athletic Career Counseling

Richard H. Perry (University of Southern California): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee on Player Agents, I move adoption of Proposal No. 118.

[The proposal was seconded.]

This legislation will permit a member institution to appoint a three-member panel from among its staff members employed outside the athletics department to counsel student-athletes about future professional athletic careers and to require that the members of the panel be identified to the NCAA national office.

I also move adoption of Proposal No. 118-1.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 118-1 (page A-102) was approved.]

We talked about the intent. I would only reiterate that the members of the Special Committee on Player Agents believe it is incumbent upon them to make sure the student-athletes become better guided as to staying in school and/or leaving for a professional career. It is important that the athletes fully understand what they may or may not do in relation to signing and receiving advice with respect to professional careers.

Jerry D. Claiborne (University of Kentucky): Mr. President, I would like to urge the passage of No. 118. We have had the round-table discussions involving our coaches as members of the American Football Coaches Association, and these people are also urging the passage of this proposal. We feel the advice given by someone on our campus who actually has no monetary interest to talk to these men can do a great deal of good in really explaining to them exactly what the value of the degree they receive and what they can do by staying there and what they can do by leaving.

Now, I am not certainly advocating that anybody advise a young man to not sign a \$3 million contract for a three-year period, to stay in school maybe. I think that is may be to his advantage to leave. I just believe that people on our campus who can be very objective and sit down in a three-man panel and talk to these young people can do a better job of keeping them in school.

I think that with the new leagues that are being formed in professional football, a lot of people are saying, "Well, I can be another young man who can get a million-dollar contract," when really they cannot. In fact, some of them will have a very difficult time even making a professional football team. I think all of these things need to be pointed out to them in a very objective way by some people who have really their best interests at heart. Then, before a young man becomes involved with a professional agent, he would have had a lot of things pointed out to him that a professional agent talking to him at one time might not explain the same way.

We have also found out that when young men leave a university to go into professional sports before they get their degree, it is tougher for them to come back. We would like to do everything we can to keep them in school until they have completed their degree. We not only urge the passage of this proposal, we urge that the people on your campuses really become involved in this situation because they really need this advice. I certainly urge this group to pass Proposal No. 118.

[Proposal No. 118 (pages A-101-102) was approved as amended by No. 118-1.]

[Proposal No. 119 (pages A-102-103) was withdrawn.]

Permissible Expenses—Complimentary Admission

Pamela Gunsten (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): Would it be appropriate at this time to move adoption of Proposal No. 115? Could we have the agenda reordered? The chair withdrew the amendment before I could make it to the mike.

President Toner: It is appropriate.

Ms. Gunsten: I would like to then move adoption of Proposal No. 115.

[The proposal was seconded.]

This increases the permissible benefits for student-athletes. I think it is a very reasonable and defensible exception, allowing an athlete in the sport other than their own to get in free of charge to other athletic events on this campus. This will create an esprit de corps by allowing the student-athletes to receive admission to the regular-season home intercollegiate athletic contests in all sports. These will be complimentary tickets but they cannot in turn be sold. It guards against the misuse by other than nonathletes. It is permissive legislation, not required, and I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 115 (page A-100) was approved.]

Basketball Playing Season

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I would like to move to reorder the agenda to take up Proposal No. 143, which has severe basketball scheduling implications for both Divisions II and III for the next scheduling year.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Proposal No. 143 would provide the opportunity for Division II and Division III teams to start their basketball season on the Friday preceding Thanksgiving, which actually from now until the year 2000 would allow you only to have this privilege in two years. You would gain one week in November.

[Proposal No. 143 (page A-104) was approved by Divisions II and III.]

Permissible Expenses—Special Recognition

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, on behalf of the members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

I also move adoption of the amendment to Proposal No. 120, No. 120-1.

The purpose of Nos. 120 and 120-1 is to permit an institution to pay the expenses of a team to travel to the national or state capital when invited by the president or governor for special recognition. We have deleted the word "governor" because we felt that might have some problems. I am sure this applies to a variety of others. We know of the somewhat embarrassing situation that we were in last year.

[Proposal No. 120-1 (pages A-103-104) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 120 (page A-103) was approved.]

Infractions—Council Appeal Procedure

Frank J. Remington (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I move that the order of the agenda be changed to allow us to take up Proposal No. 156 at this time. I just want to say that No. 156, I believe, is not controversial. It is important that it be taken up at this time so that the procedure can be enacted during the coming year.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

I move adoption of No. 156.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 156 sets the standards for appeals before the Council in the event that an institution desires to appeal the finding of the Infractions Committee. It is like the appellate courts of this country, which have worked very well. I believe it is in the interest of the Council and the member institutions to have it adopted.

[Proposal No. 156 (pages A-106-107) was approved.]

Basketball Playing Season

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): I would like to request that we reorder the agenda to take up No. 144, which would allow for a Thanksgiving tournament in basketball for the next two years. Without it, we cannot have one.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

I move adoption of No. 144.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 144 (pages A-104-105) was approved by Division I.]

Permissible Awards

Carole J. Houston (Bowling Green State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Extra Events Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

The present interpretation of the constitution precludes any items given as awards that are not listed in the NCAA Manual. The intent of this amendment is to permit flexibility in the awards program. With this passage, the new items as listed before you may be presented. Keep in mind that all awards must be personalized.

[Proposal No. 121 (page A-104) was approved.]

Ethical conduct—Gambling Activities

Cecil N. Coleman (Midwestern City Conference): Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose reordering the agenda to consider Nos. 154 and 155.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 154.

[The proposal was seconded.]

I call your attention to the amendment, No. 154-1, which inserts the same language that was in No. 79 at the request of legal counsel to limit this to intercollegiate athletic competition. I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 154-1 (pages A-105-106) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 154 (page A-105) was approved.]

Gambling and Bribery

Cecil N. Coleman (Midwestern City Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 155.

[The motion was seconded.]

Just once again, Mr. President, this takes into account Resolution No. 134 that passed last year and ties Nos. 79, 154 and 155 together. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 155 (page A-106) was approved.]

Special Recognition

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): Is it appropriate to ask if the time clock is going to stop now or what your wishes are on this under our rules?

President Toner: I have already indicated that the Convention order was to adjourn at noon. The intent was to allow everyone to stay through the meetings knowing full well that is when it would adjourn, and they could make their plans to be off after that hour. This was repeated again this morning, President Horn. This is the intention of the chair.

Mr. Horn: I merely want to say before we stop that I think all of us owe you a debt of gratitude for the urbaneness and equitability with which you presided over this Convention. (Applause) Now, if your Yankee face is not going to blush even more, I would like to offer a suggestion. It seems to me,

John, that the Council might consider how we could meet in smaller rooms for at least an hour simultaneously with some of the divisions, perhaps I-A and I-AA together, and dispense with an hour or two of business during these sessions. Then maybe we could finish the agenda on time. I think that if you look at the agenda, some of those things would be reordered to be acted on solely by divisions.

President Toner: Thank you, President Horn. I can't let the opportunity go by and not congratulate the delegates, because without you this could not have been done. Thank you very much.

[The session adjourned at noon.]

Appendix A

78th Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1983-84 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 78th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 78th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Proposal Numbers	General Topic
1 through 4	Consent—Constitution, Special Rules
5 through 23	Consent—Bylaws, Other Legislation
24 through 34	Academic Requirements
35 through 48	Governance
49 through 65	Financial Aid
66 through 79	Eligibility
80 through 93	Championships
94 through 108	Recruiting
109 through 113	Membership and Classification
114 through 122	Amateurism
123 through 146	Playing and Practice Seasons
147 through 153	Personnel Limitations
154 through 162	Resolutions

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules

Proposals 1 through 4 are offered as a "consent package" of constitutional and other amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting allied member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption.

NO. 1 PRINCIPLE OF SOUND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), page 16, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Has been admitted as a **regularly matriculated**, de-

gree-seeking student in accordance with the regular, published entrance requirements of that institution;”

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Testing and Requirements Committee).

Intent: To affirm that a student-athlete must be admitted as a regularly matriculated, degree-seeking student in accordance with the regular, published entrance requirements of the institution in order to be eligible for intercollegiate athletic competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 1 through 4 were approved as a constitution consent package.

NO. 2 CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

A. Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 3, pages 29-31, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

“Section 3. Classes and Divisions of Membership. Membership shall be of the following classes: active, *allied conference*, *associate*, and affiliated and **corresponding**. The bylaws may prescribe the procedure whereby the active and *allied conference* memberships of the Association may be divided into divisions for purposes of bylaw legislation and competition in NCAA championship meets and tournaments.

[Paragraph (a) unchanged.]

“(b) *Allied Conference* members shall consist of athletic conferences or associations of colleges and universities that **conduct conference competition and determine a champion in one or more sports (in which the Association conducts championships or for which it is responsible for providing playing rules for intercollegiate competition), duly elected to conference membership under the provisions of the bylaws.** *all* All of the members of which the conference are shall be active members of this Association, duly elected to allied membership under the provisions of the bylaws., **except that** A a conference or an association with 40 or more members may qualify as an *allied a conference* member if 90 percent of its member institutions are active members of the Association.

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) and (i) through (iv) unchanged except for editorial revisions to change “allied” to “conference” in each instance.]

“(c) Associate members shall consist of educational institutions not eligible for active membership due to their not being accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency or their not meeting the requirements of Constitution 4-2-(g) or not qualifying for membership in any division, duly elected to associate membership under the provisions of the bylaws. Associate members are not required to apply the academic or athletic rules of the Association except for the provisions of Articles 2 and 3 of this constitution. They shall be entitled to all privileges of active members except the right to compete in meets, tournaments or contests under the auspices of

the Association; the right to vote; the right of their representatives, as such, to hold any elective office in the Association except membership on committees, and the right to be included in the Association’s statistics program.

“(d) (c) Affiliated members shall consist of other groups and associations *intimately related to intercollegiate athletics in their the functioning and purposes of which are directly related to one or more sports in which the Association conducts championships*, duly elected under the provisions of the bylaws. Affiliated members shall be entitled to be represented by one nonvoting delegate at the annual Convention of the Association and shall have such other privileges as may be accorded to affiliated members by the bylaws of the Association.

“(d) Corresponding members shall consist of institutions, organizations, conferences and individuals desiring to receive the Association’s membership publications and mailings, but which are not eligible for active, conference or affiliated membership, duly elected under the provisions of the bylaws. They shall receive all publications and mailings received by the general membership of the Association and shall not otherwise be entitled to any membership privileges, including the right to use the Association’s name, seal, logo or other insignia.”

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 2-(b), (c) and (d), page 109, relettering subsequent paragraph, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(b) Election to *Allied Conference* Membership. Athletic conferences or associations, eligible for *allied conference* membership under Constitution 4-3-(b), may be elected to such *allied conference* membership by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting at an annual Convention or by a majority vote of the Council.

“(c) Election to Associate Membership. Educational institutions not eligible for active membership may be elected to associate membership by majority vote of the delegates present and voting at an annual Convention or by majority vote of the Council.

“(d) (c) Election to Affiliated Membership. Other groups or associations eligible for affiliated membership under the provisions of the constitution of this Association may be elected to affiliated membership by majority vote of the delegates present and voting at an annual Convention or by majority vote of the Council.

“(d) Election to Corresponding Membership. Institutions, organizations, conferences and individuals desiring to receive the Association’s membership publications and mailings may be elected to corresponding membership by majority vote of the Council or by the Administrative Committee.”

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 3-(c), page 110, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The annual dues of the various classes of membership, effective September 1, 1984, shall be:

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) unchanged.]

"(4) **Allied Conference** members in Division I, \$700.

"(5) **Allied Conference** members in Division II, \$350.

"(6) **Allied Conference** members in Division III, \$350.

"(7) **Associate members**, \$175.

"(8) **(7) Affiliated members**, \$175.

"(8) **Corresponding members**, \$175."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(e)-(6), page 114, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(6) An institution which does not meet the criteria of any division at the end of the 'unclassified membership' period prescribed by the Classification Committee shall be reclassified as an **associate a corresponding member**."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To revise the NCAA membership structure by renaming allied members as conference members and limiting that classification to those conferences conducting conference competition in at least one NCAA sport; to eliminate the associate member category; to limit affiliated membership to those organizations directly involved in at least one NCAA sport, and to establish a corresponding-member category open to any institution, organization or individual not eligible for any of the other membership categories. [Note: Necessary editorial revisions will be made in other legislation to change "allied" to "conference" and to delete references to associate members.]

Effective Date: September 1, 1984.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 3 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS MAILING DATE

A. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 2, page 45, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than November 22 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention. **If the Council establishes a date later than November 1 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Constitution 7-1-(a), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendment to the members.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 2, page 148, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 2. The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association no later than

November 22 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention. **If the Council establishes a date later than November 1 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Bylaw 13-1-(a), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendment to the members.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To authorize the Council to establish a later date for mailing a copy of proposed amendments for the annual Convention in years when the Council has established a later date for the submission of amendments as a result of a special Convention being held after November 1.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 4 ELECTIONS

Special Rules of Order: Add a new Section 5, page 150, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"**Section 5. Elections. Elections of NCAA officers, Council members, committee members or other representatives of the Association shall not be bound by the requirement in Robert's Rules of Order that all candidates in an election remain in contention until one receives a majority.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that NCAA elections are not bound by the requirement in Robert's Rules of Order that all candidates in an election remain in contention until one receives a majority.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

Consent Package—Bylaws and Other Legislation

Proposals 5 through 23 are offered as a "consent package" of bylaw and other proposals considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting allied member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon by a single vote, with a majority vote required for approval.

NO. 5 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 7-(b), page 55, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) Facilities of a member institution shall not be made available unless:

"(1) Such an intrastate contest in the sport of football

or basketball, conducted following completion of the participants' high school eligibility in the sport and prior to their high school graduation, first is sanctioned by the appropriate state high school athletic association or, if interstate, the appropriate state high school athletic association refuses to take jurisdiction, such a contest first is sanctioned by the NCAA All-Star High School Games Committee in accordance with Constitution 3-9-(a);

"(2) Such an interstate contest in the sport of football or basketball, conducted following completion of the participants' high school eligibility in the sport and prior to their enrollment in college, first is sanctioned by the NCAA All-Star High School Games Committee in accordance with Constitution 3-9-(a), or

"(3) Use of such facilities is approved by the NCAA Council in accordance with Bylaw 1-6-(c)-(4)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify those instances in which it is permissible for an institution to permit its facilities to be utilized for a high school all-star game.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 5 through 11, 13 through 16 and 18 through 23 were approved as a bylaws and other legislation consent package.

NO. 6 MAXIMUM AWARDS—WOMEN'S SKIING

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(b), page 98, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) For women's sports: **Skiing 7**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(h), pages 99-100, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(h) Division II—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) For women's sports: **Skiing 7**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish maximum awards limitations for women in the sport of skiing.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 7 MAXIMUM AWARDS—WOMEN'S SOCCER

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(b), page 98, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) For women's sports: **Soccer 11**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(h), pages 99-100, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(h) Division II—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) For women's sports: **Soccer 11**"

Source: NCAA Council (Women's Soccer Committee).

Intent: To establish maximum awards limitations for women in the sport of soccer.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 8 COACHING LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(c)-(2), page 103, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) A member institution may permit undergraduate student-athletes who have *completed* **exhausted** their eligibility **in the sport** or who have become injured to the point they are unable to practice or compete ever again in intercollegiate athletics, *provided they are at the institution at which they participated in intercollegiate athletics and have eligibility remaining under Bylaw 4-1*, to participate in such coaching **provided they are at the institution at which they participated in intercollegiate athletics, they have eligibility remaining under Bylaw 4-1 (the five-year rule)**, they are completing the requirements for their baccalaureate degree, they remain full-time students in the institution, they receive no compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution other than the financial aid they received as student-athletes and they are not permitted to recruit or scout off campus."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To affirm that undergraduate student coaches must remain at the institution where they participated in intercollegiate athletics and must be within the five-year period established by Bylaw 4-1.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 9 STATEMENTS OF DIVISION PHILOSOPHIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1, pages 113-115, by adding new paragraph (b), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(b) The membership of a division or subdivision through appropriate deliberative processes may prepare a statement of division philosophy relating to the development and operation of an intercollegiate athletic program in the division. Such a statement may be adopted at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote of the delegates of the division present and voting and, if adopted, shall be published in the NCAA Manual. Such a statement is not binding on member institutions but shall serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs by institutions and conferences.”

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To authorize the publication of division statements of philosophy.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 10 ALL-STAR HIGH SCHOOL GAMES COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(c), pages 132-133, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(c) The All-Star High School Games Committee shall consist of five members, including two positions allocated for men, one allocated for a woman and two unallocated. **At least one member of the committee shall be from each of the following geographic regions: (1) Districts 1 and 2, (2) District 3, (3) Districts 4 and 5, and (4) Districts 6, 7 and 8.** It shall act in the place of any state high school association which declines to assume jurisdiction in approving all-star football or basketball contests as set forth in Constitution 3-9-(a). [Note: If and when the Association certifies women’s all-star high school games, the committee shall include two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and one unallocated.]”

Source: NCAA Council (All-Star High School Games Committee).

Intent: To establish regional representation requirements for membership on the All-Star High School Games Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 11 CLASSIFICATION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(d), page 133, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(d) The Classification Committee shall be responsible for the classification and reclassification of the division membership of each member institution. It shall review each application for active membership in the Association to determine whether the applicant meets the applicable provisions set forth in Bylaws 10 and 11. It

also shall conduct an annual review to determine whether each member institution is continuing to meet the criteria of its division. The committee shall consist of *three* **nine** members *from each division*, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and three unallocated. *and a chair to be selected at large.* **Four members shall be from Division I, two members from Division II and two members from Division III, and one shall be selected at large.”**

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To reduce the membership of the Classification Committee from 10 to nine, with four members from Division I, two each from Divisions II and III, and one selected at large.

Effective Date: Immediately; committee shall conform to requirement as attrition permits.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 12 COMMITTEE ON COMPETITIVE SAFEGUARDS AND MEDICAL ASPECTS OF SPORTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(f), page 133, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(f) The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports shall consist of *13* **11** members, including four positions allocated for men, four allocated for women and *five* **three** unallocated.

“(1) The membership of the committee shall *represent the fields of* **be constituted as follows: athletics administration directors (one man and one woman, no assistant or associate athletics directors), active coaching (one member), physical education, exercise physiology research (one member), medicine (three members, of whom at least one shall be a woman and at least one shall be an orthopedic surgeon), athletic training (one man or woman responsible for the total athletic training program at a member institution) and, law (one member), with one member elected from the chair of the NCAA Football Rules Committee and one member who shall represent secondary school interests.”**

[Subparagraphs (2) and (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Intent: To reduce the membership of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports from 13 to 11 and to earmark the positions on the committee as set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately; committee shall conform to requirement as attrition permits.

Action: Defeated after being removed from consent package.

NO. 13 LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(p), page 135, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(p) The Long Range Planning Committee shall consist of **13** members, including at least one representative from each division; two undergraduate student-athletes who are varsity letter winners; at least one former president and one former secretary-treasurer of the Association; a college president; a full-time, salaried executive officer of an allied conference, and a member of the Council. Four positions shall be allocated for men **(including a male student-athlete)**, four allocated for women **(including a female student-athlete)** and **five two** unallocated. *including one male and one female student-athlete.* Whenever possible, members of the committee should have appreciable years of experience in the Association. **At least five members of the Committee shall have served as NCAA officers or members of the NCAA Council or Executive Committee.** It shall identify and examine trends and problems of intercollegiate athletics, recommend goals and suggest to the Council courses of action which the Association may wish to pursue."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To reduce the membership of the Long Range Planning Committee from 13 to 10, specifying that at least five members of the committee must have served as NCAA officers or members of the NCAA Council or Executive Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately; committee shall conform to requirement as attrition permits.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 14 NATIONAL YOUTH SPORTS PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(q), page 135, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(q) The National Youth Sports Program Committee shall be responsible for administering the National Youth Sports Program. The committee shall consist of **six five** representatives from active or allied members of the Association (including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and **two one** unallocated. *one of which shall be an undergraduate student-athlete who is a varsity letter winner*) and an appropriate number of ex officio members representing the Federal government. *Members of the committee may be reappointed without limitation.*"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To reduce the membership of the National Youth Sports Program Committee from six to five by eliminating the position earmarked for a student-athlete and to apply the normal committee service limitations to the members of that committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 15 PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(u), page 136, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(u) The Public Relations and Promotion Committee shall consist of **15 eight** members, including **10 four** representatives from Division I-A, **one representative from Division I-AA**, **two one** representatives from Division II, **two one** representatives from Division III and the sports information director from the NCAA president's institution. **Five Three** positions shall be allocated for men, **five three** allocated for women and **five two** unallocated.

"(1) Of the Division I representatives, six shall represent Division I-A member institutions and two shall represent Division I-AA member institutions. Two shall serve as at-large members and represent other Division I members. At least one member shall be a director of athletics at a Division I-A institution.

"(2) The committee shall study and make recommendations concerning the Association's public relations program, shall determine the policies and categories for the Association's national statistics program, shall develop and administer promotional activities for the benefit of the membership generally and for the Association and its championship events, and shall conduct such other projects as the Council may direct."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To reduce the membership of the Public Relations and Promotion Committee from 15 to eight and to restructure the committee as set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 16 GENERAL TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, pages 132-138, by deleting paragraph (z), relettering subsequent paragraph, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(z) The General Television Committee shall consist of 10 members, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and four unallocated. Seven shall represent Division I members and three shall represent Division II and Division III members, with each of the latter divisions being represented by at least one member. The committee shall study and report to the Council and the Executive Committee on television issues and developments, other than those relating to football, which the committee believes should be considered by the membership."

Source: NCAA Council (General Television Committee).

Intent: To abolish the General Television Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 17 SPORTS COMMITTEES—SECRETARY-RULES EDITORS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(a)-(4), page 138, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction **and shall be a nonvoting member of the committee:** Baseball, Men’s Basketball Rules, Men’s Fencing, Football Rules, Men’s Ice Hockey, Men’s Soccer, Men’s Swimming, Men’s Track and Field and Wrestling.”

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(b), pages 138-139, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(b) The Baseball Committee shall consist of ~~13~~ **14** members and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

“(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II, *and* three members shall be from Division III. *one* **and an additional** member shall be *elected* secretary-rules editor, and”

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(c), page 139, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(c) The Men’s Basketball Rules Committee shall consist of ~~13~~ **14** members and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

“(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II, *and* three members shall be from Division III **and an additional member shall be secretary-rules editor,** and

[Subparagraph (3) unchanged.]

“(4) One of the members shall be elected chair *and one shall be elected secretary-rules editor.*”

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(e), page 139, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(e) The Football Rules Committee shall consist of ~~14~~ **15** members and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

“(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II, *and* three members shall be from Division III **and an additional member shall be secretary-rules editor;**

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4) unchanged.]

“(5) One of the members shall be elected chair *and one shall be elected secretary-rules editor.*”

E. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(g), page 140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(g) The Men’s Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of ~~eight~~ **nine** members and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

“(3) *One* **An additional** member shall be *elected* secretary-rules editor.”

[Subparagraph (4) unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(k), page 141, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(k) The Men’s Soccer Committee shall consist of ~~13~~ **14** members and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

“(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II, *and* three members shall be from Division III; *one* **and an additional** member shall be *elected* secretary-rules editor, and”

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4) unchanged.]

G. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(l), page 141, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(l) The Men’s Swimming Committee shall consist of ~~13~~ **14** members, one of whom shall have expertise in diving, and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

“(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II, *and* three members shall be from Division III; *one* **and an additional** member shall be *elected* secretary-rules editor, and”

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4) unchanged.]

H. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(n), pages 141-142, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(n) The Men’s Track and Field Committee shall consist of ~~13~~ **14** members and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

“(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II, *and* three members shall be from Division III; *one* **and an additional** member shall be *elected* secretary-rules editor, and”

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4) unchanged.]

I. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(q), pages 142-143, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(q) The Wrestling Committee shall consist of ~~13~~ **14** members

and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II, and three members shall be from Division III: *one and an additional* member shall be *elected* secretary-rules editor, and"

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that the sports committee secretary-rules editors who are permitted to be reelected without restriction be nonvoting members of those committees and to add one member to each such committee where necessary to maintain the specified division representation ratio.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions after being removed from consent package and amended by No. 17-1. (141-110 in Division I, 95-33 in Division II, 92-72 in Division III.)

NO. 17-1 SPORTS COMMITTEES-SECRETARY-RULES EDITORS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 17-A; Bylaw 12-4-(a)-(4), as follows, and delete Proposal Nos. 17-C and 17-D:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction and shall be a nonvoting member of the committee; Baseball, *Men's Basketball Rules*, Men's Fencing, *Football Rules*, Men's Ice Hockey, Men's Soccer, Men's Swimming, Men's Track and Field and Wrestling."

Source: University of New Hampshire.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 18 MEN'S LACROSSE AND MEN'S WATER POLO RULES EDITORS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(a)-(4), page 138, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: Baseball, Men's Basketball Rules, Men's Fencing, Football Rules, Men's Ice Hockey, **Men's Lacrosse**, Men's Soccer, Men's Swimming, Men's Track and Field, **Men's Water Polo**, and Wrestling."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(h), page 140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, common vote]

"(h) The Men's Lacrosse Committee shall consist of *eight* **nine** members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) Four members shall be from Division I, one member shall be from Division II, two members shall be from Division

III, and one member shall be elected at large **and an additional member shall be secretary-rules editor.**

"(2) *One member shall be elected secretary-rules editor.*"

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4), renumbered as (2) and (3), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Lacrosse Committee, Men's Water Polo Committee).

Intent: To permit the secretary-rules editors of the Men's Lacrosse and Men's Water Polo Committees to be reelected without restriction and to add one member to the Men's Lacrosse Committee to maintain the current division representation ratio.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 19 MEN'S GYMNASTICS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(f), pages 139-140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) **At least one representative from each of the following geographic regions: (i) Districts 1 and 2, (ii) District 3, (iii) Districts 4 and 5, and (iv) Districts 6, 7 and 8;**"

[Subparagraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4), renumbered as (2), (3), (4) and (5), respectively, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Gymnastics Committee).

Intent: To establish regional representation requirements for membership on the Men's Gymnastics Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 20 MEN'S LACROSSE COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(h)-(1), page 140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Four members shall be from Division I, *one member shall be from Division II*, two members shall be from Division III and *one* **two** shall be elected at large."

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Lacrosse Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the Division II position on the Men's Lacrosse Committee and specify that two members of the committee shall be elected at large.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 21 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SKIING COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(j), page 140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(j) The Men's and Women's Skiing Committee shall consist of six members. Two positions shall be allocated for men, two allocated for women and two unallocated. **One member shall be selected from the West skiing region, two members shall be selected from the East skiing region and three shall be selected at large.** One member shall be elected secretary-rules editor."

Source: NCAA Council (Men's and Women's Skiing Committee).

Intent: To establish regional representation requirements for membership on the Men's and Women's Skiing Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 22 MEN'S SOCCER COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(k), page 141, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(k) The Men's Soccer Committee shall consist of 13 members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) **At least two Not more than one** representatives from each of the following geographical regions: (i) Districts 1 and 2, (ii) District 3, (iii) Districts 4 and 5 and (iv) Districts 6, 7 and 8 **a division's men's soccer regions;**"

[Subparagraphs (2), (3) and (4) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Soccer Committee).

Intent: To establish regional representation requirements for membership on the Men's Soccer Committee based on each division's soccer regions rather than NCAA districts.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

NO. 23 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP PERCENTAGES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1, pages 151-152, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) **For the purposes of meeting the required minimum sponsorship percentages set forth in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a) and 1-1-(b), member institutions sponsoring no varsity intercollegiate athletics programs for men shall not be included in making calculations concerning men's championships and member institutions sponsoring no varsity intercollegiate athletics programs for women shall not be**

included in making calculations concerning women's championships."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that member institutions sponsoring varsity intercollegiate athletics programs for only one sex shall not be included in making calculations concerning the minimum sponsorship percentages for championships for the other sex.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 5.

Academic Requirements

NO. 24 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), pages 80-82, by adding new subparagraph (iv), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iv) **The student-athlete must have earned the following accumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000) to be eligible for: (1) a first season of competition after the freshman year in any sport: 1.700; (2) a second season of competition after the freshman year in any sport: 1.850; (3) a third or fourth season of competition after the freshman year in any sport: 2.000."**

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To establish qualitative academic progress requirements for eligibility.

Effective Date: August 1, 1985.

Action: Defeated by Division I (107-189) and Division II.

NO. 25 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 81, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies at the institution which is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of *acceptable* degree credit, **acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program**

of studies at the institution, since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing (i.e., not on academic probation) as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), pages 80-82, by adding new subparagraphs (iv) and (v), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iv) Certifying institutions shall submit annual reports to the NCAA Academic Testing and Requirements Committee documenting that each student-athlete has satisfied the requirements set forth in the provisions of this regulation. These reports shall be completed by the institution's chief executive officer or by a senior academic official designated by the chief executive officer. The individual submitting the reports shall certify that he or she personally has reviewed the academic records of the institution's student-athletes and shall state whether each student-athlete is in good academic standing and enrolled in a specific baccalaureate degree program, and whether each student-athlete has satisfied the quantitative hour requirements necessary to show satisfactory academic progress. The individual also shall state any other information that is necessary to demonstrate full compliance with the provisions of this regulation.

"(v) The NCAA shall be empowered, on a spot-check basis, to require Division I and Division II member institutions to supply transcripts and other relevant materials, in confidence, to verify compliance with the provisions of this regulation and to enable the NCAA national office to assist member institutions in understanding how to achieve full compliance."

Source: University of California, Los Angeles; Hampton Institute; Harvard University; Louisiana State University; University of Washington; University of Wisconsin, Parkside, and one other member institution (American Council on Education).

Intent: To specify that a student must be in good academic standing as defined by the certifying institution in order to meet the requirements of the satisfactory-progress rule, to require Division I and Division II member institutions to certify annually to the NCAA Academic Testing and Requirements Committee compliance with the satisfactory-progress rule, and to authorize spot checks by authorized representatives of the NCAA to verify compliance.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Part A approved by Divisions I and II as amended by Nos. 25-1 and 25-2. Part B defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 25-1 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 25-A; Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(ii), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies at the institution which is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of degree credit, acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies at the institution, since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing (i.e., not on academic probation) as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree."

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California, and three other Pacific-10 Conference member institutions.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

No. 25-2 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 25; Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6), as follows:

[Divided bylaw; Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1985.*"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 25-3 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 25; Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6), as follows:

[Divided bylaw; Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1984.*"

Source: Louisiana State university.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 25-2.

NO. 26 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 81 as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit *acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies at the institution* which is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of *acceptable degree credit* since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Testing and Requirements Committee).

Intent: To delete repetitive language that also is set forth in subparagraph (iii) of the satisfactory-progress rule.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 25-A.

NO. 27 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(9), page 82, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a 2.000 nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for financial aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college **and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit accepted toward a specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Select Committee on Athletic Problems and Concerns in Higher Education).

Intent: To require a junior college transfer student who was a 2.000 nonqualifier to demonstrate satisfactory progress toward a specific baccalaureate degree, as well as graduate from the junior college, in order to be immediately eligible for financial aid, practice and competition upon transfer to a Division I member institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 27-1.

NO. 27-1 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 27; Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(9), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a 2.000 nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for financial

aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit *accepted toward a specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution.*"

Source: University of Arizona; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California, and three other Pacific-10 Conference member institutions.

Action: Defeated by Division I (120-127).

NO. 27-2 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 27; Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(9), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a 2.000 nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for financial aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit **accepted acceptable** toward a *specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution.*"

Source: University of California, Los Angeles.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 28 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(8)-(ii), page 82, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000, **satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of credit accepted in a specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution during each academic term of attendance** and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To require a junior college transfer student who was a 2.000 qualifier, but who has not graduated from junior college, to demonstrate satisfactory progress toward a specific baccalaureate degree in order to be immediately eligible upon transfer to a Division I member institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 28-1.

NO. 28-1 TRANSFER-JUNIOR COLLEGE

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 28; Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(8)-(ii), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000, satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of credit *accepted in a specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution* during each academic term of attendance and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference and all eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 29 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS-ACCEPTABLE DEGREE CREDIT

Bylaws: Amend Situation No. 592, page 9, The NCAA News, May 18, 1983, relating to Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(iii), as follows:

[Divisions I and II, common vote]

"Situation: Effective August 1, 1984, the calculation of credit hours under the eligibility requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6) [satisfactory-progress rule] shall be based upon hours earned or accepted for degree credit in a specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution.

"Question: In what manner may a student-athlete who has not yet declared a major, or who changes his or her major, meet the requirements of this legislation?

"Answer: During the first two years of enrollment, a student-athlete who has not yet declared a major may use credits acceptable toward any of the institution's degree programs in meeting the satisfactory-progress requirements. A student-athlete would be required to declare a major by the beginning of the third year of *enrollment athletic competition or the fourth year of enrollment* (*fifth seventh semester or seventh tenth quarter*); from that point, the credits used to meet the satisfactory-progress requirements must be degree credit toward the student's declared degree program. A student-athlete who changes his or her major may comply with the satisfactory-progress requirements if the change in majors is documented appropriately by the institution's academic authorities, if the credits earned prior to the change are acceptable toward the degree previously sought and if the credits earned from the time of the change are acceptable toward the new desired degree."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To change the time by which a student-athlete must declare a major in order to meet the requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(iii).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 29-1.

NO. 29-1 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS-ACCEPTABLE DEGREE CREDIT

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 29; Situation No. 592, as follows:
[Divisions I and II, common vote]

"Situation: Effective August 1, 1984, the calculation of credit hours under the eligibility requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6) [satisfactory-progress rule] shall be based upon hours earned or accepted for degree credit in a specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution.

"Question: In what manner may a student-athlete who has not yet declared a major, or who changes his or her major, meet the requirements of this legislation?

"Answer: During the first two years of enrollment, a student-athlete who has not yet declared a major may use credits acceptable toward any of the institution's degree programs in meeting the satisfactory-progress requirements. A student-athlete would be required to declare a major by the beginning of the third year of athletic competition or the fourth year of enrollment (seventh semester or tenth quarter), **whichever occurs first**; from that point, the credits used to meet the satisfactory-progress requirements must be degree credit toward the student's declared degree program. A student-athlete who changes his or her major may comply with the satisfactory-progress requirements if the change in majors is documented appropriately by the institution's academic authorities, if the credits earned prior to the change are acceptable toward the degree previously sought and if the credits earned from the time of the change are acceptable toward the new desired degree."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 30 RESOLUTION: FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the freshman year in college is for most students a period of critical and delicate academic and social adjustment and transition; and

"Whereas, the pressures of time and competition that are necessarily involved in participation in major intercollegiate football and basketball are quite often not conducive to such transition and adjustment; and

"Whereas, limiting freshman participation to subvarsity (i.e., freshman or junior varsity) competition would substantially reduce these pressures;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council draft for submission to the 1985 Convention legislation that limits freshman participation in the sports of football and basketball in Division I to practice and to competition on subvarsity teams; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that such legislation contain provisions that (a) limit eligibility for athletically related financial aid to freshmen who have a minimum accumulative 2.000 high school grade-point average; (b) limit eligibility for practice and subvarsity competition during the freshman year to freshmen who have met the academic standards of the 2.000 rule as amended by the 1983 NCAA Convention; (c) limit varsity participation for those who participated as freshmen to three years of competition in the four-year period following the freshman year, and (d) provide for a limit of 26 initial and 104 total grants-in-aid in football and of four initial and 16 total grants-in-aid in basketball, such limits to include freshmen."

Source: University of California, Los Angeles.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 31 JUNIOR COLLEGE GRADE-POINT REQUIREMENT

Bylaws: Amend Case No. 318, page 317, relating to Bylaws 5-1-(j)-(8)-(ii), 5-1-(j)-(10)-(ii) and 5-6-(b), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Situation: A student-athlete attends a junior college and then transfers to an NCAA member institution.

"Question: In determining the student-athlete's grade-point average for transferable degree credits as required by NCAA legislation, what courses should be considered?

"Answer: All grades earned by a student in courses that would be transferable to the certifying institution shall be included in determining whether the student has earned the required average, regardless of the grade earned or the fact that such grade is not considered as a transferable degree credit. **Only the last grade earned in a course that has been repeated shall be included in the grade-point average calculation.**"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To specify that only the last grade earned in a course that has been repeated shall be utilized in calculating the junior college grade-point average for a junior college transfer student.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 32 PRINCIPLE OF SOUND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(3), pages 16-17, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Is enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies and is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a student-athlete who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies and has athletic

eligibility remaining may participate if the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. Further, a student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided the student-athlete has athletic eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within *five years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution* **the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1.**"

Source: American International College, Babson College, University of Bridgeport, Franklin and Marshall College, Springfield College, West Chester University of Pennsylvania, and four other member institutions.

Intent: To restrict the eligibility of a graduate or professional school student to the time period set forth in Bylaw 4-1 (five-year rule) rather than limiting the period to five years from the student's initial enrollment in a collegiate institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 33 ELIGIBILITY—2.000 RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 79-83, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: A 2.000 qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative six, seven or eight semesters' minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence. **An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early-admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class.]"**

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University, and two other Pacific-10 Conference member institutions.

Intent: To authorize the Eligibility Committee to grant exceptions to the 2.000 rule to permit outstanding high school students who

enter a member institution under an early-admissions program prior to high school graduation to be eligible for practice, competition and financial aid during their first academic year of residence.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 34 ELIGIBILITY—2.000 RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 79-83, as follows:

[Division I only]

“[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses, including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early-admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student’s class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]”

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University, and two other Pacific-10 Conference member institutions.

Intent: To authorize the Eligibility Committee to grant exceptions to the 2.000 rule to permit outstanding high school students who enter a member institution under an early-admissions program prior to high school graduation to be eligible for practice, competition and financial aid during their first academic year of residence.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Division I.

Governance

NO. 35 BOARD OF PRESIDENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5 by adding new Section 2, page 35, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“Section 2. Board of Presidents. There shall be a Board of Presidents, which shall consist of 44 members. The Board of Presidents shall act only when it determines that a matter significantly affects the academic standards, the financial integrity or the reputation of the member institutions. Whenever the Board of Presidents acts, it shall issue a statement that explains why such action is necessary and how such action falls within the Board’s jurisdiction. The existing policymaking bodies of the Association shall continue to have jurisdiction over matters that relate exclusively to athletic programs or administrative issues, including the day-to-day management of the Association’s affairs. The actions of the Board of Presidents thus will complement the actions of existing policy-making bodies and will help to further the purposes and principles set forth in Articles 2 and 3 of the constitution.

“(a) The Board of Presidents shall be constituted as follows:

“(1) The 44 members of the Board of Presidents shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members.

“(i) The 22 Division I representatives shall include one representative from each Division I-A football-playing conference, one representative from each of the four Division I-AA Football Championship regions, two representatives of Division I-A institutions that do not belong to a football-playing conference, four representatives of Division I members that do not sponsor football in Division I and the remaining representatives selected at large. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four from each of the four Division I representation regions as set forth in Constitution 5-5.

“(ii) The 11 Division II representatives shall include at least two from each of the four Division II representation regions as set forth in Constitution 5-5.

“(iii) The 11 Division III representatives shall include at least two from each of the four Division III representation regions as set forth in Constitution 5-5.

“(2) The 44 members of the Board of Presidents shall

be elected to serve for a term of four years. The terms of no more than six Division I representatives, no more than three Division II representatives and no more than three Division III representatives shall expire in any one year. Members of the Board of Presidents shall not be eligible for election to another term on the Board of Presidents until two years have elapsed.

"(3) Whenever necessary to adjust the membership of the Board of Presidents so that vacancies will occur in the proper sequence, members may be appointed for less than full terms. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term. In these instances, members who serve more than one-half term shall be considered to have served a full term.

"(4) The Board of Presidents shall act as one body to deal with matters of overall Association policy and interdivision interests that fall within its jurisdiction. The 44 members of the Board of Presidents shall represent their respective divisions as members of Board of Presidents committees identified as Division I, Division II and Division III Steering Committees of the Board of Presidents, which shall consider and act upon matters that relate solely to those divisions. The steering committees of the Board of Presidents shall report their actions to the full Board of Presidents at its next meeting, and any division decision shall stand unless overruled by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Board of Presidents present and voting.

"(5) To be eligible to serve on the Board of Presidents, an individual currently shall be serving a member institution as its chief executive officer. If a Board of Presidents member's status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets this requirement, the individual shall be replaced on the Board of Presidents with an individual chosen by a majority vote of the Board of Presidents at the time of the Board's next meeting.

"(6) The membership of a 'playing conference' (i.e., one which conducts a regular conference schedule or a postseason meet or tournament to determine its champion in football or basketball) may not be represented on the Board of Presidents by more than one individual, excluding the chairman and vice-chairman.

"(b) No person may serve on the Board of Presidents more than two terms.

"(c) For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Board of Presidents. Unless otherwise specified in this constitution or in the bylaws, all actions of the Board of Presidents shall be by majority vote. The Board of Presidents shall meet imme-

diately after its election, prior to or immediately after the business sessions of the annual Convention and at such other times as the chairman of the Board of Presidents may direct.

"(d) The initial members of the Board shall be elected from a slate of nominees that is prepared by a committee composed of (i) three chief executive officers who currently serve on the Council, including, to the maximum extent practicable, one who shall represent Division I, one who shall represent Division II and one who shall represent Division III, and (ii) the elected heads, or their delegates, of the five major presidentially based higher educational associations located in Washington, D.C., and listed herein.* Thereafter, the Board of Presidents shall appoint a Nominating Committee, which shall present to the Board prior to the annual Convention a full slate of nominees to serve as members of the Board of Presidents and as members of the various committees of the Board of Presidents, respectively, for the ensuing year. Additional candidates shall be placed on the appropriate slate of nominees if such candidates have the endorsement of at least 10 chief executive officers of member institutions. In all cases, an effort should be made to compose a balanced slate that is fairly representative of the regions, conferences and institutions that make up the Association.

"(1) Members of the Board of Presidents, including the initial members, shall be elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions. A chief executive officer may vote only for candidates that represent institutions within the same division as that chief executive officer. Voting by proxy shall not be allowed.

"(2) Members of the various committees of the Board of Presidents shall be elected from among the members of the Board of Presidents by a majority vote of the Board's members. The vote may be either written or by voice, but may not be made by proxy.

"(3) The officers of the Board of Presidents shall be elected from among the members of the Board of Presidents by a majority vote of the Board's members. The vote may be either written or by voice, but may not be made by proxy.

"(e) In case a vacancy occurs among the members of the Board of Presidents, its officers or its committee members, the Board of Presidents may fill the vacancy for the unexpired term by a majority vote.

"(f) The Board of Presidents may establish from among its members such committees as may be necessary for executing its functions under the provisions of this constitution or of the bylaws and provide for their appointment or election, tenure and duties. The actions of all such commit-

tees shall be subject to approval by the Board of Presidents.

"(1) The Board of Presidents shall establish an Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents, which shall consist of eight members, three of whom shall be the current officers of the Board of Presidents. Among those eight members, at least one shall represent Division I members, at least one shall represent Division II members and at least one shall represent Division III members.

"(2) The Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents shall:

"(i) Nominate candidates to serve as the chairman, vice-chairman and secretary of the Board of Presidents;

"(ii) Develop the agenda for the meetings of the Board of Presidents;

"(iii) Transact necessary items of business on behalf of the Board of Presidents that arise in the interim between meetings of the Board, subject to the approval of the Board of Presidents at its next meeting, and

"(iv) Report its proceedings to the Board of Presidents on a regular basis.

"(3) For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents. The Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents shall meet at such times as the chairman of the Board of Presidents may direct.

"(g) The officers of the Board of Presidents shall consist of a chairman, a vice-chairman and a secretary. The terms of these officers shall be as specified elsewhere in this constitution or, if not so specified, as determined by the Board of Presidents.

"(h) The Board of Presidents' jurisdiction shall be limited to those matters that significantly affect the academic standards, the financial integrity or the reputation of the member institutions, as determined by the Board of Presidents. Those matters that relate exclusively to athletics programs or administrative issues, including the day-to-day management of the Association's affairs, shall be outside the Board of Presidents' jurisdiction.

"(i) Within its jurisdiction, the Board of Presidents shall have the power to:

"(1) Advise and make suggestions to the Council and Association;

"(2) Suggest and/or commission studies or reports that relate to the manner in which athletics affect member institutions and their students, including the effect that athletics have upon the academic standards and programs of member institutions;

"(3) Propose new bylaws, interpretations or resolutions;

"(4) Propose amendments to existing bylaws, interpretations or resolutions;

"(5) Propose amendments to this constitution;

"(6) Suspend temporarily the implementation of any new or amended bylaw, resolution or constitutional provision that is enacted by the Association's delegates at any annual or special Convention, and suspend temporarily any Council or Administrative Committee interpretation of the bylaws or constitution, provided that the Board of Presidents shall review all such suspensions prior to the subsequent annual Convention and take a final vote enacting the bylaw, interpretation, resolution, amendment or constitutional provision that the Board had temporarily suspended; and

"(7) Approve the appointment of any new executive director and present to the Executive Committee of the Association, in confidence and at appropriate intervals, the Board of Presidents' evaluation of the performance of the executive director and the administrative staff of the Association in carrying out the rules and policies that fall within the Board of Presidents' jurisdiction.

"(j) In each instance in which it exercises its powers, the Board of Presidents shall issue a written statement explaining the reasons for the action and the basis of the Board of Presidents' jurisdiction.

"(k) Unless it determines that exceptional circumstances require immediate action on its part, the Board of Presidents shall submit to the Council all Board proposals to enact, amend or suspend bylaws, interpretations, resolutions or constitutional provisions. The Board of Presidents shall submit such proposals to the Council at least six months prior to the subsequent annual Convention and as soon as possible prior to a subsequent special Convention. The Council shall review and discuss the Board's proposals to the extent that it deems appropriate and then shall submit its views to the Board of Presidents in time to enable the Board to place its proposals before the subsequent Convention for consideration. The Board of Presidents shall consider the views of the Council before making a final decision on any Board proposal.

"(l) To ensure the accountability of the Board of Presidents, enactments, amendments or suspensions of bylaws, interpretations, resolutions or constitutional provisions that are proposed by the Board of Presidents shall not become effective until the Association has had the opportunity to overrule the proposal by a two-thirds majority vote of the delegates present and voting at the subsequent annual or special Convention. At the request of the Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents, the vote shall be

conducted by roll call. If an enactment, amendment or suspension of a bylaw, interpretation, resolution or constitutional provision that is proposed by the Board of Presidents is not overruled at the appropriate Convention, it shall become effective immediately and binding upon the membership.

"(m) The Board of Presidents shall report its proceedings to the business session of the annual Convention.

"(n) The Board of Presidents may transact such part of its business by correspondence as it may deem advisable.

"(o) The operations of the Board of Presidents, including any studies or reports commissioned by the Board, shall be supported by the administrative staff and resources of the Association and shall be funded in their entirety from the Association's budget. All expenses incurred by members of the Board of Presidents in performing Board duties shall be reimbursed by the Association in the manner provided for reimbursement of committee expenses in Executive Regulation 2-1."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(f), page 35, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(f) In case a vacancy occurs among the officers of the Association or on the Council, the Executive Committee or other committees of the Association, **with the exception of the Board of Presidents and its committees**, the Council may fill the vacancy for the unexpired term by a majority vote, except that a person so elected to the Council shall serve until the next annual Convention."

C. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(c)-(1) and (2), page 36, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) The Executive Committee shall:

"(1) Transact the business and administer the affairs of the Association in accordance with the policies of the Association, **and the Council and the Board of Presidents;**"

"(2) Employ an executive director, with the approval of the Council **and of the Board of Presidents**, and employ such other persons as may be necessary to conduct efficiently the business of the Association."

D. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 3-(c)-(2)-(iii), page 37, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) The secretary-treasurer shall be responsible for:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"(iii) Printing such matter as the Association, the Council, **the Board of Presidents, the Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents** or the Executive Committee may direct;"

[Subparagraphs (iv) and (v) unchanged.]

E. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 4-(c), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) For the purpose of representation on **both** the NCAA Council, as set forth in Section 1 of this article, **and the Board of Presidents, as set forth in Section 2 of this article**, the Association shall be divided into geographical regions as follows:"

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

F. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 5, page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 5. Committees. The bylaws shall provide for such standing committees as the Association may consider necessary and may establish the number of members and tenure of all committees established by the constitution and bylaws except the Executive Committee **and all committees of the Board of Presidents.**"

G. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(b) and (c), page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Special meetings of the Association shall be called by the president on the written request of 12 or more members of the Council, **or on the written request of the Board of Presidents.**

"(c) **With the exception of legislation proposed by the Board of Presidents, which shall be adopted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2**, All all legislation of the Association shall be adopted with the three divisions meeting in joint session at the annual Convention or a special meeting of the Association."

H. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(a), page 42, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 1. Bylaws. (a) The Association *may*, at any annual or special Convention, **and the Board of Presidents, at such times as it deems appropriate and subject to review by the Association as prescribed in Constitution 5-2**, may adopt or amend any bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution by a majority vote of the members present and voting, except where a greater percentage may be required by the bylaws. Bylaws may be adopted or amended by vote of a membership division within the Association **or within the Board of Presidents** as prescribed by **the constitution or the bylaws.**"

I. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 2, pages 42-43, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. Interpretations. The Council, in the interim between Conventions; *and* the Administrative Committee, in the interim between meetings of the Council, **and the Board of Presidents, at such times as are prescribed in Constitution 5-2**, are empowered to make interpretations of the constitution and bylaws which shall be binding after their publication and

circulation to the membership, or after notification to a member institution when the interpretation is limited to that institution and not of general significance or application to the membership at large. Any member of the Association may request that any such interpretation **by either the Council or the Administrative Committee** be passed upon by the next annual Convention by making request in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the business session of the Convention. **Association review of any interpretation by the Board of Presidents shall be in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2.**

"(a) If an interpretation of the constitution submitted to the Convention fails to receive a two-thirds majority of those delegates present and voting, thereafter it shall not be binding upon the membership, **except for an interpretation of the constitution proposed by the Board of Presidents, which shall become binding upon the membership as prescribed in Constitution 5-2.**

"(b) If an interpretation of the bylaws submitted to the Convention fails to receive a majority of those delegates present and voting, thereafter it shall not be binding upon the membership, **except for an interpretation of the bylaws proposed by the Board of Presidents, which shall become binding upon the membership as prescribed in Constitution 5-2.**

"(c) All interpretations approved by the Convention shall be incorporated into the constitution or bylaws as official interpretations. Other interpretations issued by the Council, **by the Board of Presidents or by the officers** also may be included in the official interpretations if so designated by the Council **or by the Board of Presidents in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2.**

"(d) If a member institution submits a proposed amendment to an existing official interpretation of the constitution, the amendment must be submitted in accordance with the provisions of Constitution 7-1. If a member institution submits a proposed amendment to an existing official interpretation of the bylaws, the amendment must be submitted in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 13-1. The Council may amend an existing official interpretation by utilizing the procedures set forth at the beginning of this section, **and the Board of Presidents may amend an existing official interpretation by utilizing the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2.**

"(e) An interpretation of the bylaws shall be applicable to those membership divisions to which the bylaw it interprets applies. Interpretations applying to more than one division shall be voted upon by the affected divisions acting as a single group, **except for an interpretation of the bylaws applying to more than one division proposed by the Board of Presidents, which shall be voted upon in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2.**"

J. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 4, pages 43-44, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. Resolutions. Legislation may be enacted through resolutions not inconsistent with the constitution, bylaws, published interpretations, special rules of order, executive regulations, recommended policies, enforcement program and football television plan at any annual or special Convention by a majority of the delegates present and voting, provided the legislation is of a temporary character effective only for the time specified in the resolution itself, and provided further that the proposed resolution shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the business session, except for those resolutions sponsored by the Council, which shall observe the procedure set forth in Bylaw 13-4. **In addition, the Board of Presidents may enact legislation by utilizing the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2.**

[Paragraph (a) unchanged.]

"(b) If a majority of the delegates present and voting so direct, such resolution shall be referred to the entire membership for a mail vote conducted by the officers under conditions approved by the Council, **except for a resolution proposed by the Board of Presidents, which shall be voted upon in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2.** A two-thirds majority of members voting in any such mail vote shall be required for the enactment of the legislation proposed in the resolution."

[Paragraph (c) unchanged.]

K. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 45, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 1. (a) This constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted to the secretary of the Association by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than November 1 (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 25) preceding an annual Convention, or 60 days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after November 1. **This constitution also may be amended by a two-thirds majority of the Board of Presidents in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2.**"

L. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Sections 3 and 4, pages 45-46, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 3. **Except for an amendment to the constitution proposed by the Board of Presidents, which shall become effective in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2, a proposed amendment to the constitution**

may be amended at a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the business session. The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session.

"Section 4. The Council or the Board of Presidents may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in Constitution 7-3, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council or by a majority of the Board of Presidents, respectively, and copies are distributed before or during the business session."

- M. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 12 by adding new Section 4, page 138, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 4. Board of Presidents' Appointed Committees. The Board of Presidents is empowered to establish from among its members such committees as it deems necessary and to provide for their appointment or election, tenure and duties. The actions of such committees shall be subject to approval of the Board of Presidents. Insofar as any other sections of this bylaw are inconsistent with this section, they shall not apply to the committees of the Board of Presidents."

- N. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 13, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (a), page 147, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. (a) The Board of Presidents shall be exempt from complying with the provisions of this bylaw. The Board of Presidents may amend bylaws in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2."

- O. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 13, Section 1-(f), page 148, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) With the exception of legislation proposed by the Board of Presidents, which shall be adopted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2, all All legislation of the Association shall be adopted with the three divisions meeting in joint session at the Convention."

- P. **Special Rules of Order:** Amend Section 1-(c), page 149, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) Any member of the NCAA Council, the Board of Presidents or the NCAA Executive Committee and the chair (or a committee member designated to speak for the chair) of an NCAA

committee listed in Bylaw 12 may actively participate in the business proceedings."

- Q. **Special Rules of Order:** Amend Section 4-(c), page 150, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) When the actions of the Board of Presidents are subjected to a vote of the Association's delegates in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-2, the method of voting shall be by roll call as provided in Constitution 5-2. Voting by roll call in all other instances or voting by secret ballot shall be conducted only when so ordered by a majority of the eligible voters present and voting, following the making of an undebatable motion to vote in that manner. If both a roll-call vote and a secret ballot are moved on a particular issue not raised by the Board of Presidents, the vote shall be taken first on whether to vote by roll call."

- R. **Executive Regulations:** Amend Regulation 3, page 174, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"The Association has adopted regulations authorizing the Council to indemnify its officers, members of the Council and Executive Committee, members of the Board of Presidents and its committees, members of general and sports committees, members of special committees, and the national office staff against certain expenses, judgments, fines and settlement payments incurred in connection with legal actions brought against them because of their service in such capacities. The specific provisions, conditions and limitations of this authorization, as adopted by the Executive Committee, were circularized to the membership in the Official Notice of the 71st NCAA Convention and also appear in the Official Program and the printed Proceedings of that Convention."

- S. **Enforcement Procedure:** Amend Section 1-(a), page 186, by adding new subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) Consider studies and reports which may be filed with the Association by the Board of Presidents relating to the manner in which athletics affects academic standards and programs of member institutions;"

Source: University of California, Los Angeles; Grinnell College; Hampton Institute; Louisiana State University; University of Washington; University of Wisconsin, Parkside, and two other member institutions (American Council on Education).

Intent: To establish a Board of Presidents within the Association; to specify its composition, terms, meeting procedures, quorum, election procedures and authority; to provide for an Executive Committee and other committees of the Board of Presidents; to specify that the Board of Presidents shall issue written statements explaining its actions; to establish a procedure by which the NCAA

Council would review all Board of Presidents proposals to enact, amend or suspend bylaws, interpretations, resolutions or constitutional provisions, except those requiring immediate action; to specify that the Board of Presidents may establish Association policies applicable to the NCAA Executive Committee; to permit the Board of Presidents to call a special Convention of the Association; to establish legislative authority for the Board of Presidents to adopt or amend bylaws, interpretations, resolutions and constitutional provisions, with those actions to become effective if they are not overruled by a two-thirds majority vote of the delegates at the subsequent annual Convention; to permit the Board of Presidents to specify that such vote of the delegates be by roll call; to include the Board of Presidents in the Association's indemnification authorization, and to specify that the Committee on Infractions shall consider reports submitted by the Board of Presidents.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated as amended by Nos. 35-1 and 35-2 (313-328; two-thirds majority required).

NO. 35-1 BOARD OF PRESIDENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 35-A, Constitution 5-2, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. Board of Presidents. There shall be a Board of Presidents, which shall consist of 44 members. The Board of Presidents shall act only when it determines that a matter significantly affects the academic standards, *the financial integrity or the reputation of the member institutions.* Whenever the Board of Presidents acts, it shall issue a statement that explains why such action is necessary and how such action falls within the Board's jurisdiction. The existing policymaking bodies of the Association shall continue to have jurisdiction over **all other matters** *that relate exclusively to athletic programs or administrative issues, including the day-to-day management of the Association's affairs.* The actions of the Board of Presidents thus will complement the actions of existing policymaking bodies and will help to further the purposes and principles set forth in Articles 2 and 3 of the constitution.

[Paragraph (a) subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) The Board of Presidents shall act as one body to deal with matters of overall Association policy *and interdivision interests that fall within its jurisdiction* **significantly affecting academic standards of the member institutions.** The 44 members of the Board of Presidents shall represent their respective divisions as members of Board of Presidents' committees identified as Division I, Division II and Division III Steering Committees of the Board of Presidents, which shall consider and act upon matters that relate solely to those divisions. The steering committees of the Board of Presidents shall report

actions to the full Board of Presidents at its next meeting, and any division decision shall stand unless overruled by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Board of Presidents present and voting.

[Subparagraphs (5) and (6) and paragraph (b) unchanged.]

"(c) For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Board of Presidents. Unless otherwise specified in this constitution or in the bylaws, all actions of the Board of Presidents shall be by majority vote. **Voting may be either written or by voice, but may not be made by proxy.** The Board of Presidents shall meet immediately after its election, prior to or immediately after the business sessions of the annual Convention and at such other times as the chairman of the Board of Presidents may direct.

[Paragraphs (d), (e), (f) subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

"(3) For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents. **Voting may be either written or by voice, but may not be made by proxy.** The Executive Committee of the Board of Presidents shall meet at such times as the chairman of the Board of Presidents may direct.

[Paragraph (g) unchanged.]

"(h) The Board of Presidents' jurisdiction shall be limited to those matters that significantly affect the academic standards, *the financial integrity or the reputation of the member institutions, as determined by the Board of Presidents. These* **Other matters that relate exclusively to athletics programs or administrative issues, including the day-to-day management of the Association's affairs,** shall be outside the Board of Presidents' jurisdiction.

[Paragraph (i) subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6) unchanged.]

"(7) Approve the appointment of any new executive director and present to the Executive Committee of the Association, in confidence and at appropriate intervals, the Board of Presidents' evaluation of the performance of the executive director and the administrative staff of the Association in carrying out the rules and policies that fall within the Board of Presidents' jurisdiction."

[Paragraphs (j), (k), (l), (m), (n) and (o) unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 35-C, Constitution 5-2-(c)-(1) and (2), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) The Executive Committee shall:

[Paragraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Employ an executive director, with the approval of the Council *and of the Board of Presidents,* and employ such other persons as may be necessary to conduct efficiently the business of the Association."

Source: Duke University.

Action: Part A defeated except for revision in subparagraph (f)-(3); Part B approved, 297-247.

NO. 35-2 BOARD OF PRESIDENTS

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 35-A, Constitution 5-2, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. Board of Presidents. There shall be a Board of Presidents, which shall consist of 44 members. **The purpose of the Board of Presidents shall be to strengthen the responsibility and commitment of the Association as it oversees the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.** The Board of Presidents shall act only when it determines that a matter significantly affects the academic standards, *the or financial integrity stability or the reputation* of the member institutions. [Remainder of paragraph unchanged.]

"(a) The Board of Presidents shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) The 44 members of the Board of Presidents shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. **At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division.**

[Subparagraphs (i), (ii), (iii), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) The Board of Presidents shall act as one body to deal with matters of overall Association policy and inter-division interests that fall within its jurisdiction. The 44 members of the Board of Presidents shall represent their respective divisions as members of Board of Presidents committees identified as Division I, Division II and Division III Steering Committees of the Board of Presidents, which shall consider and act upon matters that relate solely to those divisions. **A division decision must be approved by a majority of those elected to the Board to represent that division.** The steering committees of the Board of Presidents shall report their actions to the full Board of Presidents at its next meeting, and any division decision shall stand unless overruled by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Board of Presidents present and voting.

[Subparagraphs (5) and (6) and paragraphs (b) and (c) unchanged.]

"(d) The initial members of the Board shall be elected from a slate of nominees that is prepared by a committee composed of (i) three chief executive officers who currently serve on the Council, including, to the maximum extent practicable, one who shall represent Division I, one who shall represent Division II and one who shall represent Division III, and (ii) the current elected heads **and the immediate past elected heads**, or their **respective** delegates, of the five major presidentially based higher educational associations located in

Washington, D.C., and listed herein.* **The committee shall nominate for all offices except Division I-A football playing conferences and from each of the four Division I-AA football championship regions. The presidents of each of the Division I-A football-playing conferences shall elect one of their members to the Board. Nominees for election to represent each of the four Division I-AA football championship regions shall have the endorsement of at least five chief executive officers in the relevant region.** [Remainder of paragraph and subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

[Paragraphs (e), (f) and (g) unchanged.]

"(h) The Board of Presidents' jurisdiction shall be limited to those matters that significantly affect the academic standards, *the or financial integrity stability or the reputation* of the member institutions, as determined by the Board of Presidents. Those matters that relate exclusively to athletics programs or administrative issues, including the day-to-day management of the Association's affairs, shall be outside the Board of Presidents' jurisdiction.

[Paragraph (i) subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) unchanged.]

"(6) *Suspend Temporarily* **delay** the implementation of any new or amended bylaw, resolution or constitutional provision that is enacted by the Association's delegates at any annual or special Convention, and *suspend temporarily* any Council or Administrative Committee interpretation of the bylaws, or constitution, *provided that the Board of Presidents shall review all such suspensions prior to the subsequent annual Convention and take a final vote enacting the bylaw, interpretation, resolution, amendment or constitutional provision that the Board had temporarily suspended; and*

[Subparagraph (7) and paragraph (j) unchanged.]

"(k) *Unless it determines that exceptional circumstances require immediate action on its part,* The Board of Presidents shall submit to the Council all Board proposals to enact, amend or *suspend* **delay** bylaws, interpretations, resolutions or constitutional provisions. The Board of Presidents shall submit such proposals to the Council at least six months prior to the subsequent annual Convention and as soon as possible prior to a subsequent special Convention. The Council shall review and discuss the Board's proposals to the extent that it deems appropriate and then shall submit its views to the Board of Presidents in time to enable the Board to place its proposals before the subsequent Convention for consideration. The Board of Presidents shall consider the views of the Council before making a final decision on any Board proposal.

"(l) To ensure the accountability of the Board of Presidents, enactments, **or** amendments *or suspensions* of bylaws,

interpretations, resolutions or constitutional provisions that are proposed by the Board of Presidents shall not become effective until the Association has had the opportunity to overrule the proposal by a *two-thirds* majority vote of the delegates present and voting at the *subsequent* ensuing annual or special Convention and any actions temporarily delayed shall be automatically reconsidered at that Convention. If a Board proposal pertains only to a single division, only delegates from that division shall have the opportunity to overrule the proposal and that decision must be approved by a majority of those elected to the Board from that division. The Association shall vote by roll call when voting on all Board proposals, including those that are subject only to divisional voting. If an enactment, or amendment or suspension of a bylaw, interpretation, resolution or constitutional provision that is proposed by the Board of Presidents is not overruled at the appropriate Convention, it shall become effective immediately and binding upon the membership."

[Paragraphs (m), (n) and (o) unchanged.]

Source: University of California, Los Angeles.

Action: Approved.

[NOTE: Sequence of action on No. 35—No. 35-2 considered prior to No. 35-1 by consent of Convention. Motion to cease debate on No. 35-2 approved. No. 35-2 approved. No. 35-1 divided twice by consent of Convention. First portion defeated; second and third portions approved. Motion to cease debate on No. 35 as amended approved. Motion for roll call defeated. No. 35 as amended defeated. Motion to reconsider roll-call vote defeated, 283-353.]

*American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Association of American Universities, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

NO. 36 NCAA PRESIDENTS' COMMISSION

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5 by adding new Section 4, page 38, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. Presidents' Commission. There shall be a Presidents' Commission of the Association, which shall consist of 44 members and shall be elected at the annual Convention of the Association.

"(a) The Presidents' Commission shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives

of each division shall be elected by the membership of that division present and voting at the division round table during the annual Convention.

"(i) The 22 Division I representatives shall include one representative from each Division I-A football-playing conference, one representative from each of the four Division I-AA football championship regions, two representatives of Division I-A institutions that do not belong to a football-playing conference, four representatives of Division I members that do not sponsor football in Division I, and the remaining representatives selected at large, including one from Division I-A, one from Division I-AA and one from Division I members that do not sponsor football in Division I. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four from each of the four Division I representation regions as set forth in Constitution 5-5.

"(ii) The 11 Division II representatives shall include at least two from each of the four Division II representation regions as set forth in Constitution 5-5.

"(iii) The 11 Division III representatives shall include at least two from each of the four Division III representation regions as set forth in Constitution 5-5.

"(2) The 44 members of the Presidents' Commission shall be elected to serve for a term of four years. The terms of no more than six Division I representatives, no more than three Division II representatives and no more than three Division III representatives shall expire in any one year. Members of the Commission shall not be eligible for another term on the Commission until two years have elapsed.

"(3) Whenever necessary to adjust the membership of the Commission so that vacancies will occur in the proper sequence, members may be appointed for less than full terms. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term. In these instances, members who serve more than one-half term shall be considered to have served a full term.

"(4) The Commission shall act as one body to deal with matters of overall Association policy and inter-division interests. The 44 members of the Commission shall represent their respective divisions as members of Commission subcommittees, which shall consider and act upon matters relating to those divisions. The division subcommittees shall report their actions to the full Commission, and any division decision shall stand un-

less overruled by a two-thirds vote of the Commission members present and voting.

"(5) The Commission shall elect one of its members to serve as chair, serving in that capacity for a two-year period. Each of the division subcommittees also shall elect one of its members to serve as chair of separate meetings of the subcommittee, and those individuals also shall serve for a two-year period.

"(6) To be eligible to serve on the Presidents' Commission, an individual currently shall be serving a member institution as its chief executive officer. If a Commission member's status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets this requirement, the individual shall be replaced on the Commission at the time of the next Convention.

"(7) The membership of a 'playing conference' (i.e., one which conducts a regular conference schedule or a postseason meet or tournament to determine its champion in football or basketball) may not be represented on the Commission by more than one individual, excluding the chair, except that a woman serving on the Commission may represent the same playing conference as a man serving on the Commission.

"(b) No person may serve on the Commission more than two terms.

"(c) For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Commission. For the transaction of business by a division subcommittee, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of that subcommittee. The Commission shall meet after the annual NCAA Convention (but prior to the spring meeting of the NCAA Council), once in the summer (or prior to the fall meeting of the NCAA Council) and at such other times as it may request.

"(d) The Presidents' Commission is empowered to:

"(1) Review any activity of the Association;

"(2) Place any matter of concern on the agenda for any meeting of the Council or for any NCAA Convention;

"(3) Commission studies of intercollegiate athletics issues and urge certain courses of action;

"(4) Propose legislation directly to any Convention;

"(5) Establish the final sequence of legislative proposals in any Convention agenda, within the provisions of Section 2-(e) of the Special Rules of Order;

"(6) Call for a special meeting of the Association under the provisions of Constitution 5-6.

"(e) Prior to the annual Convention, the Presidents'

Commission shall appoint 12 chief executive officers of member institutions (six representing Division I and three each representing Division II and Division III, with the committee to include at least one woman) to serve as a nominating committee to report to the Convention nominees for vacancies on the Presidents' Commission.

"(f) The Presidents' Commission shall appoint such committees of its membership as it deems necessary.

"(g) In case a vacancy occurs among the members of the Commission between annual Conventions, the Commission may fill the vacancy by a majority vote, and a person so elected shall serve until the next annual Convention.

"(h) The Presidents' Commission, in cooperation with the NCAA Council, shall determine appropriate arrangements for liaison and exchange of information between the two bodies."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(b), page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Special meetings of the Association shall be called by the president on the written request of 12 24 or more members of the Council or 24 or more members of the Presidents' Commission."

C. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(b) and (c), page 45, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, or a division steering committee or the Presidents' Commission, each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of six active members, submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer, faculty athletic representative or director of athletics or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

[Paragraph (c) unchanged.]

"(1) If the Council, or a division steering committee or the Presidents' Commission votes to sponsor such an amendment, no further sponsorship is required.

"(2) If the Council, or a division steering committee or the Presidents' Commission does not vote to sponsor the amendment, it will not be circularized to the membership unless verified sponsorship by six active members is received in accordance with the amendment deadlines."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 1-(b) and (c), page 147, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, or a division steering committee or the Presidents' Commission,

each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of six active members, submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer, *faculty athletic representative or director of athletics* or the **chief executive officer's designated representative**.

[Paragraph (c) unchanged.]

"(1) If the Council, or a division steering committee or the **Presidents' Commission** votes to sponsor such an amendment, no further sponsorship is required.

"(2) If the Council, or a division steering committee or the **Presidents' Commission** does not vote to sponsor the amendment, it will not be circularized to the membership unless verified sponsorship by six active members is received in accordance with the amendment deadlines."

E. Special Rules of Order: Amend Section 3-(a), pages 149-150, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) Unless otherwise specified, all amendments to the constitution or bylaws shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention. Those specified as being effective immediately shall become effective upon adjournment of the Convention. **If a voting delegate objects to the proposed immediate effective date, or to any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all members eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate effective date. If it is not so approved, the effective date shall be the first day of August following adoption by the Convention.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Governance Review).

Intent: To establish a Presidents' Commission within the Association; to specify its composition, terms, meeting procedures, quorum, authority and election procedures; to permit 24 members of either the NCAA Council or the Presidents' Commission to call a special Convention of the Association; to permit the Presidents' Commission to submit legislation directly to an NCAA Convention, and to establish a procedure whereby any delegate can object to a proposal becoming effective immediately, with a two-thirds majority of the eligible voters required to override that objection.

Effective Date: Immediately. [Note: See Appendix B for explanation of initial and continuing selection processes for service on NCAA Presidents' Commission.]

Action: Approved as amended by No. 36-1.

NO. 36-1 NCAA PRESIDENTS' COMMISSION

A. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 36-A, Constitution 5-4, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. Presidents' Commission. There shall be a Presidents' Commission of the Association, which shall consist of 44 members and shall be elected at the annual Convention of the Association.

"(a) The Presidents' Commission shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. *The representatives of each division shall be elected by the membership of that division present and voting at the division round table during the annual Convention.*"

[Subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 36-A, Constitution 5-4-(a), by adding new subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) The initial members of the Commission shall be elected from a slate of nominees that is prepared by a committee composed of (i) three chief executive officers who currently serve on the Council, including, to the maximum extent practicable, one who shall represent Division I, one who shall represent Division II and one who shall represent Division III, and (ii) the current elected heads and the immediate past elected heads, or their respective delegates, of the five major presidentially-based higher educational associations located in Washington, D.C., and listed herein*. The committee shall nominate for all offices except Division I-A football playing conferences and from each of the four Division I-AA football championship regions. The presidents of each of the Division I-A football playing conferences shall elect one of their members to the Board. Nominees for election to represent each of the four Division I-AA football championships regions shall have the endorsement of at least five chief executive officers in the relevant region. Thereafter, the Presidents' Commission shall appoint a Nominating Committee which shall present to the Commission prior to the annual Convention a full slate of nominees to serve as members of the Commission and as members of the various committees of the Commission, respectively, for the ensuing year. Additional candidates shall be placed on the appropriate slate of nominees if such candidates have the endorsement of at least ten chief executive officers of member institutions. In all cases, an effort

should be made to compose a balanced slate that is fairly representative of the regions, conferences and institutions that make up the Association.

"(i) Members of the Presidents' Commission, including the initial members, shall be elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions. A chief executive officer may vote only for candidates that represent institutions within the same division as that chief executive officer. Voting by proxy shall not be allowed.

"(ii) Members of the various committees of the Commission shall be elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members. The vote may be either written or by voice, but may not be made by proxy.

"(iii) The officers of the Presidents' Commission shall be elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members. The vote may be either written or by voice, but may not be made by proxy."

*American Association of State Colleges and Universities; Association of American Universities; National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education; National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities; and National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

C. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 36-A, Constitution 5-4, by deleting paragraphs (e), (f), and (g) and substituting new paragraph (e), relettering subsequent paragraph, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(e) In case a vacancy occurs among the members of the Presidents' Commission, its officers or its committee members, the Commission may fill the vacancy for the unexpired term by a majority vote."

Source: University of California, Los Angeles.

Action: Approved.

NO. 36-2 RESOLUTION: ROLL-CALL VOTE

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA Council has proposed the establishment of an NCAA Presidents' Commission as a means of involving more effectively institutional chief executive officers in NCAA procedures; and

"Whereas, numerous chief executive officers have expressed their belief that while the Presidents' Commission should not have the authority to veto, suspend or otherwise alter actions of an NCAA Convention, CEO involvement in policy deliberations would be stimu-

lated if such a body were empowered to designate in advance roll-call votes on Convention issues of major significance;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, the NCAA Council shall sponsor the appropriate amendments at the 1985 NCAA Convention that would authorize the NCAA Presidents' Commission to designate, at the time of printing of the Convention Notice, roll-call votes on specified proposals at said NCAA Convention.

"Be It Further Resolved, that this resolution shall be referred to the entire membership for a mail vote under the procedures set forth in Constitution 6-4-(b); if approved by at least two-thirds majority of the members participating in the mail vote, the provisions of this resolution shall be applicable to the 1985 Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

NO. 37 DIVISION I VOTING

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(a), page 113, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Determination of Divisions. (a) Each active member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may permit an institution's women's athletic program to be classified in a division other than its membership division if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action. In the sport of football only, Division I shall be divided into Division I-A and Division I-AA; and the membership of these subdivisions shall vote separately on legislative issues that pertain only to the sport of football. In addition, the membership of Division I-A and all other Division I members may vote separately on any issue in those bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately, with the exception of Bylaws 5-6 and 5-7."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (h), page 123, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) Members of Division I-A and all other Division I members may vote separately on any issue in the bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately, with the exception of Bylaws 5-6 and 5-7. A bylaw provision adopted by either Division I-A or by the other Division I members may be rescinded by a two-thirds vote of all members of Division I present and voting."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 1-(g), page 148, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) Only members of a division or subdivision may submit legislation that is to be applicable only to that divi-

sion or subdivision in those bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Division I Criteria).

Intent: To permit legislative autonomy for Division I-A and for the remainder of Division I in the divided bylaws, except for the championships provisions of Bylaws 5-6 and 5-7; to establish a Division I rescission procedure, and to clarify that legislation applicable only to a single division or subdivision can be submitted only by members of that division or subdivision.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated. Part A defeated by Divisions I (129-170) and II (50-93); approved by Division III. Approval by all divisions required. Motions to reconsider were approved in Divisions I and II. Part A again defeated by Division I (129-140).

NO. 38 DIVISION I-A MEETING

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 6, by adding new paragraph (b), page 39, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) There shall be an annual legislative meeting of Division I-A during the month of June, at which the Division I-A membership may adopt legislation applicable only to Division I-A and may propose legislation on other matters for consideration by the subsequent annual Convention. Legislation adopted at the Division I-A legislative meeting shall become effective immediately upon adjournment of the subsequent annual Convention, subject to the conditions of the Special Rules of Order and subject to the rescission provisions of the bylaws [Bylaw 11-1(g), Bylaw 13-1(h) and O.I. 1300]."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(c), page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) All legislation of the Association shall be adopted with the three divisions meeting in joint session at the annual Convention or a special meeting of the Association, with the exception of the annual Division I-A legislative meeting set forth in paragraph (b) of this section."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 1-(f), page 148, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) All legislation of the Association shall be adopted with the three divisions meeting in joint session at the Convention, with the exception of the annual Division I-A legislative meeting set forth in Constitution 5-6-(b)."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 1-(a), page 147, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) These bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at the annual Division I-A legislative meet-

ing by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted to the secretary of the Association by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than November 1 (any amendment received after that date shall be postmarked not later than October 25) preceding an annual Convention, or 60 days preceding a special Convention or the annual Division I-A legislative meeting. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after November 1."

E. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 2, page 148, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 2. The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than November 22 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention or the annual Division I-A legislative meeting."

F. Special Rules of Order: Amend Section 3-(a), pages 149-150, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) Unless otherwise specified, all amendments to the constitution or bylaws shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention. Those specified as being effective immediately (including those adopted at the Division I-A legislative meeting and subject to review by the subsequent annual Convention) shall become effective upon adjournment of the Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Select Committee on Athletic Problems and Concerns in Higher Education).

Intent: To establish an annual legislative meeting of Division I-A members during the month of June, to specify that the Division I-A legislative meeting could adopt legislation dealing exclusively with that subdivision and could propose legislation for consideration by the annual Convention on other matters, to specify that legislation adopted at that meeting would not become effective until adjournment of the subsequent annual Convention (or later) and would be subject to the Association's rescission procedures, and to establish deadlines for submission and circularization of proposed legislation for consideration at the Division I-A legislative meeting. [Note: Necessary adjustments to reflect the Division I-A legislative meeting in other Association meeting procedures would be made editorially.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved. Parts A and B first defeated (339-235, two-thirds majority required). After motion to reconsider approved, No. 38 was approved almost unanimously, including Parts C, D and E by all divisions.

NO. 39 NCAA COUNCIL

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a)-(2), page 33, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 (including **at least two chief executive officers** and at least six women) who shall represent Division I members, 11 (including **at least two chief executive officers** and at least three women) who shall represent Division II members, and 11 (including **at least two chief executive officers** and at least three women) who shall represent Division III members. The representatives of each division shall be elected by the membership of that division present and voting at the division round table during the annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Governance Review).

Intent: To require that at least six chief executive officers of member institutions, including at least two from each division, serve on the NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately; membership of Council shall conform to this requirement as attrition permits.

Action: Approved.

NO. 40 NCAA COUNCIL

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a)-(2)-(i), page 33, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) The 22 Division I representatives shall include one representative from each Division I-A football-playing conference, one representative from each of the four Division I-AA Football Championship regions, two representatives of Division I-A institutions that do not belong to a football-playing conference, four representatives of Division I members that do not sponsor football in Division I, **one representative from a Division I conference sponsoring only women's sports** and the remaining representatives selected at large. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four from each of the four Division I representation regions as set forth in Constitution 5-4."

Source: Boise State University, Bradley University, Eastern Illinois University, Illinois State University, Principia College, Stephens College and 19 other member institutions.

Intent: To earmark one of the Division I positions on the NCAA Council for a representative of a Division I conference sponsoring only women's sports.

Effective Date: Immediately; membership of Council shall conform to this requirement as attrition permits.

Action: Defeated (321-246; two-thirds majority required).

NO. 41 SPONSORSHIP OF AMENDMENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(b), page 45, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, or a division steering committee, each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of six active members, submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer, faculty athletic representative, or director of athletics **or primary woman athletics administrator.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 1-(b), page 147, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, or a division steering committee, each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of six active members, submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer, faculty athletic representative, or director of athletics **or primary woman athletics administrator.**"

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; California University of Pennsylvania; Hope College; University of New Hampshire; Northeastern University; College of St. Catherine, and 26 other member institutions.

Intent: To add a member institution's primary woman administrator of athletics programs to the list of individuals authorized to submit legislative proposals and amendments on behalf of the institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to approval of Nos. 36-C and D.

NO. 42 RESOLUTION: WOMEN'S MEETING

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the application of NCAA rules becomes mandatory for women's athletics programs effective August 1, 1985; and

"Whereas, the NCAA has recognized through the establishment of a four-year transition period from August 1, 1981, through August 1, 1985, that the needs of developing women's athletics programs may require differing rules from those currently utilized for men's athletics programs; and

"Whereas, the vast majority of women's athletics programs have operated under the jurisdiction of NCAA rules for the past two years and have had sufficient experience to evaluate their effect on women's athletics programs; and

"Whereas, the June 1983 meeting of selected Division I primary women administrators revealed numerous areas of concern regarding NCAA legislation and procedures; and

"Whereas, primary women administrators from all competitive

divisions have not had an opportunity to participate in a national forum to discuss the needs and interest of women's athletics within the NCAA;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA membership authorize and direct the Council to convene a meeting of primary women administrators with the Council Subcommittee on Women's Interests prior to July 1, 1984, for the purpose of developing legislation for presentation to the 1985 NCAA Convention."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; California University of Pennsylvania; Hope College; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; College of St. Catherine; Swarthmore College, and 21 other member institutions.

Action: Approved.

NO. 43 ALLIED CONFERENCE VOTING

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 3-(b)-(1) and (2), page 30, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Allied members shall be entitled to all the privileges of active members except the right to compete as such in meets, tournaments or contests under the auspices of the Association and the right to vote.

"(2) Only those allied members which meet the following criteria shall be permitted to vote on issues before the Association:

"(i) The allied member shall be both a competitive and legislative body.

"(ii) It shall be composed of at least six members in a single division, except that those allied members with at least six members which meet all other criteria for voting shall be permitted to vote on all constitutional issues and on those bylaws which apply to all three divisions of the Association as specified in Bylaw 13-1-(d). On such bylaw issues, the conference shall vote in the division in which the majority of its membership is classified. In the event that its membership is divided evenly between two divisions, the NCAA Council shall determine its voting division. Such conferences shall not vote on those bylaws which may be amended by one or more divisions acting separately.

"(iii) Conference competition must be conducted in at least four sports with at least one in each season. A season-end tournament or round-robin regular-season play will satisfy this requirement.

"(iv) Conference championship competition shall be conducted in the sport of football in order for the conference to vote on issues pertaining only to football."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To delete the opportunity for allied members to vote on NCAA legislation. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made to amend references to voting allied members in other paragraphs.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated (349-223; two-thirds majority required).

NO. 44 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1, pages 129-130, by adding new paragraph (i), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) No member of any committee shall participate in the committee's discussion concerning, or vote on, any committee action from which the member, or any organization in which the member is financially interested (other than the member's institution or the allied conference of which it is a member), may directly or indirectly derive any financial benefit. A violation of this rule by a member of a committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the committee if, following disclosure of the adverse interest of such committee member, the committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of such committee member, and the Council approves such action."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit NCAA committee members from participating in the committee's discussion concerning and vote on any committee action from which the member may directly or indirectly derive any financial benefit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 45 SPORTS COMMITTEES

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(a)-(3), page 138, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) At least one member of 25 percent of the positions on each sports committee shall be filled by a directors of athletics, primary women athletics administrators or, an individuals who is are employed full-time as the chief executive officer of an administrators by allied conferences, or individuals who are employed both part-time as administrators by allied conferences and full-time by member institutions."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a)-(3), page 143, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) At least one member of 25 percent of the positions on each sports committee shall be filled by a directors of athletics, primary women athletics administrators or, an individuals who is are employed full-time as the chief executive officer of an administrators by allied conferences, or individuals who are employed both part-time as administrators by allied conferences and full-time by member institutions."

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Committee on Committees).

Intent: To specify that not less than 25 percent of the positions on each sports committee be filled by athletics administrators.

Effective Date: Immediately; except that no individual serving on a committee shall be expected to serve a shorter period of time than customary service on that committee would dictate; in such cases, membership shall be adjusted as vacancies occur.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 46 VOLUNTEERS FOR YOUTH COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, pages 132-138, by adding new paragraph (bb), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(bb) The Volunteers for Youth Committee shall consist of five members, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and one unallocated, and shall include at least one representative from each division. At least one member of the committee shall be from each of the following geographic regions: (1) Districts 1 and 2, (2) District 3, (3) Districts 4 and 5, and (4) Districts 6, 7 and 8. It shall supervise the Volunteers for Youth program."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish the Volunteers for Youth Committee as a standing, Council-appointed committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 47 VOLUNTEERS FOR YOUTH COMMITTEE

Amend Proposal No. 46, Bylaw 12-3-(bb), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(bb) The Volunteers for Youth Committee shall consist of five members, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and one unallocated, and shall include at least one representative from each division. At least one member of the committee shall be from each of the following geographic regions: (1) Districts 1 and 2, (2) District 3, (3) Districts 4 and 5, and (4) Districts 6, 7 and 8. It shall supervise the Volunteers for Youth program. **Members of the committee may be reappointed without limitation.**"

Source: All eight members of the Midwestern City Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 48 FOOTBALL TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(y), pages 136-137, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(y) The Football Television Committee shall consist of 18 members and shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) unchanged.]

"(5) The members representing Divisions I-AA, and II and III shall include, as to each division, at least one current or former member of that division's football committee."

[Subparagraphs (6) and (7) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To delete the requirement that a Division III member of the Football Television Committee be a current or former member of that division's football committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

Financial Aid

NO. 49 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATION

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(1), page 12, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) The award of financial aid to a student-athlete which exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (*i.e.*, tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books) **as defined in Bylaw 6-1**, other than legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d), pages 19-21, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) Where a student-athlete's ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding unearned financial aid, such aid shall not be awarded for a period in excess of one academic year; and if such aid combined with that received from the following similar sources exceeds the amount defined in *Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) and the bylaws Bylaw 6-1*, the student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics."

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, pages 96-102, by deleting Section 1, as follows:

[Division III only]

"Section 1. Division III Exemption. Division III members shall be exempt from compliance with all provisions of this article."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, pages 96-102, by adding new Section 1, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Commonly Accepted Educational Expenses.

Commonly accepted educational expenses shall be limited to the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books."

Source: NCAA Council (Select Committee on Athletic Problems and Concerns in Higher Education).

Intent: To remove the definition of commonly accepted educational expenses from the constitution and place it in the bylaws. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made to conform references to commonly accepted educational expenses in other provisions to this legislation.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated (384-195; two-thirds majority required).

NO. 50 FINANCIAL AID—PELL GRANTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(2)-(iv), page 20, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board and required course-related books, plus \$900 or the amount permitted for miscellaneous expenses under the cost-of-education formula defined by the U.S. Department of Education in the administration of the Pell Grant program, whichever is less."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who receives a Pell Grant, as well as institutionally administered financial assistance, to receive a maximum combined total amount that does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved. First defeated (374-226; two-thirds majority required); then approved after motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 51 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

A. Constitution: Add new O.I. 2, following Constitution 3-1, page 9, renumbering subsequent O.I.s, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 2. An enrolled student-athlete is one who (i) has been unconditionally admitted in accordance with the regularly published entrance requirements of that institution; and either (ii) is officially registered and enrolled at the institution on the opening day of classes in any term (including the institution's summer term or summer school) in a minimum full-time academic load, or (iii) has attended a class or classes in any term (including the institution's summer term or summer school) in which the student was enrolled in a minimum full-time academic load."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 18, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Financial aid may *not* be provided a student while attending a summer school or summer term *unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year or the student is attending a summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis for all participants in the program.* Such **This** financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 54-55, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) An enrolled student-athlete who is receiving financial assistance based upon athletic ability during the summertime prior to the freshman year shall not be subject to the provisions of this section."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(1), pages 84-85, by adding new subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent subparagraph, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) An enrolled student-athlete who is receiving financial assistance based upon athletic ability during the summertime prior to the freshman year shall be subject to the transfer rule for an enrolled student-athlete."

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Iowa; Michigan State University; Ohio State University; Purdue University, and one other Big Ten Conference member institution.

Intent: To permit an incoming student-athlete to receive financial aid during the summertime prior to the student's freshman year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 52 FINANCIAL AID—BOARD AND ROOM

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(2), pages 18-19, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) If the student-athlete lives and eats in noninstitutional facilities, the institution may pay the student-athlete an amount equal to the institution's official board and room allowance as listed in its catalog, or the averaged board and room costs of all of its students-athletes living on campus, **excluding those living in the athletic dormitory or eating at the training table.** Meals provided on the training table shall be deducted at the regular cost figure from such a student-athlete's board allowance."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To exclude the costs awarded to student-athletes living in the athletic dormitory or eating at the training table from the calculation of the averaged board and room costs of students living on campus for use in determining the amount of board and room allowance a student-athlete living off campus may receive.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved.

NO. 53 FINANCIAL AID—UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT-ATHLETE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b), pages 18-19, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(b) Financial aid, including a grant-in-aid which carries with it a partial work requirement, may be awarded for any term (semester or quarter) during which a student-athlete is in regular attendance as an undergraduate with eligibility remaining under Bylaw 4-1 or within six years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution (provided the student does not receive such aid for more than five years during that period), or as a graduate eligible under Constitution 3-3-(a)-(3), provided the student-athlete is not under contract to or currently receiving compensation from a professional sports organization. Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the assisting institution and of that institution’s conference, if any.”

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; Northwestern University; Ohio State University, and two other Big Ten Conference member institutions.

Intent: To permit a maximum of five years of financial aid to an undergraduate student-athlete in a six-year period.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 54 FINANCIAL AID—ESTABLISHED AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(a), page 18, by adding new subparagraph (4), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(4) Assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program for the recognition of outstanding high school graduates on the basis of the recipient’s past performance and overall record as measured by established criteria of which athletic participation may be a major criterion; disbursement of the assistance shall be through the member institution for the educational expenses of the

recipient in attending that institution which the recipient has selected; the recipient’s choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the donor of the assistance; the awarding individual or organization and the donor of the assistance shall not be a representative of the athletic interests or an athletics booster group of a member institution; the value of the award shall not exceed the sum of \$1,000 for an academic year, and the award is for only one academic year and is provided to the recipient on only one occasion.”

Source: All nine members of the Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive an established financial aid award on the basis of the recipient’s past performance, including athletic participation, provided the award is disbursed through the recipient’s institution for educational expenses, the recipient’s choice of institutions is not restricted by the donor, the donor and awarding organization or individual are not representatives of the athletic interests or an athletics booster group of a member institution, the value of the award does not exceed \$1,000 and it is awarded to the recipient for only one academic year and on only one occasion.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 55 INCOME FROM OFFICIATING

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(1), pages 19-20, by adding new subparagraph (iii), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(iii) A student-athlete receiving aid under this section may receive compensation for officiating intramural athletic contests at the institution in which the student is enrolled without such income being computed in determining the maximum allowable financial aid, provided the compensation does not exceed the regular rate paid by the institution for officiating all intramural contests in that sport.”

Source: Central Michigan University, Southern Methodist University, Texas Christian University, Vanderbilt University, Villanova University and University of Washington.

Intent: To exempt from the maximum allowable financial aid a student-athlete can receive the amount received from officiating intramural contests at the student’s institution at the rate normally paid by the institution for officiating all such contests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 56 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 18, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Financial aid may not be provided a student while attending a summer school or summer term unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year or the student is attending a summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis for all participants in the program. Such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school, **except that the NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this restriction for member institutions that have summer terms or summer schools curtailed because of the use of their facilities for the Olympic Games.**"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To authorize the Council to grant exceptions to institutions that must curtail their summer terms to allow use of their facilities for the Olympic Games to permit them to provide financial aid to continuing student-athletes to attend summer school at other institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 57 MAXIMUM AWARDS-EQUIVALENCIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(i)-(1) and (2), page 100, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) The institution shall count the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives **based in any degree upon athletic ability** for room, board, tuition and fees as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year).

"(2) The actual amount **of financial aid based in any degree upon athletic ability** the student-athlete receives in ratio to the actual total amount the student-athlete could receive for each item listed herein shall represent a fraction of the maximum award utilized."

Source: University of Arizona; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California, and University of Washington.

Intent: To exclude financial aid that is not based in any degree upon athletic ability from counting against an institution's maximum awards permitted in an "equivalency" sport.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 58 MAXIMUM AWARDS-EQUIVALENCIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(i), page 100, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(i) With respect to sports other than men's and women's

basketball, women's gymnastics, women's tennis and women's volleyball in Division I, football in Division I-A and the total maximum awards limitation in Division I-AA, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) so long as the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sports in its division. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"(1) Member institutions whose full tuition and fees total less than \$1,000 shall use actual tuition and fees amounts in the equivalency fraction. Member institutions whose full tuition and fees total \$1,000 or more shall use \$1,000 as the amount of a full tuition-and-fees grant in the equivalency fraction and \$500 as the amount of a 50 percent tuition-and-fees grant in the equivalency fraction.

"(2) In making fractional awards, a member institution may elect to pay or waive any amount of a student-athlete's tuition and fees; if the total tuition and fees cost to a student is more than \$1,000, an award or waiver for that part of the cost above \$1,000 shall not be part of the numerator of the equivalency fraction.

"(3) (1) The institution shall count the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year). **The numerator of the equivalency fraction shall consist of the total amount awarded or received for room and board as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year), plus tuition and fees calculated as described in subparagraph (1).**

"(4) (2) The actual amount the student-athlete receives in ratio to the actual total amount the student-athlete could receive for each item listed herein shall represent a fraction of the maximum award utilized. **The denominator of the equivalency fraction shall consist of the actual total amount the student-athlete could receive for room and board and books, plus tuition and fees calculated as described in subparagraph (1).**

"(5) (3) The sum of all fractional and maximum awards received by student-athletes shall not exceed the total limit each year in the sport in question."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To establish a maximum amount (\$1,000) for tuition and fees in the equivalency computational method and to permit member institutions to subsidize any tuition over the amount without the subsidy being counted in the equivalency calculation.

Effective Date: Immediately; for those student-athletes first entering member institutions in the opening term (semester or quarter) of the 1984-85 academic year and for all renewals of financial aid

applicable to that term.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 59 MAXIMUM AWARDS—EQUIVALENCIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(i), page 100, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(i) With respect to sports other than men’s and women’s basketball, women’s gymnastics, women’s tennis and women’s volleyball in Division I, football in Division I-A, and the total maximum awards limitation in football in Division I-AA and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of **dollar value (equivalency)** so long as the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of ‘commonly accepted educational expenses’ **in-state tuition and fees, on-campus room and board, and books** at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport in its division. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

“(1) The institution shall count the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year).

“(2) The actual amount the student-athlete receives in ratio to the actual total maximum amount the student-athlete could receive for each item listed herein shall represent a fraction of the maximum award utilized. **If an athlete from out of state is receiving at least an amount equal to in-state tuition and fees, the extra cost of out-of-state tuition and fees may be granted to that athlete and would not count toward the overall dollar limit. The number of athletes in a sport receiving out-of-state tuition and fees shall be limited to the number of full grants-in-aid for that sport.**

“(3) The sum of all fractional and maximum awards received by student-athletes shall not exceed the total limit each year in the sport in question.”

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To establish a method of making equivalency calculations utilizing a total dollar value based on in-state tuition and fees, on-campus room and board, and books.

Effective Date: August 1, 1985.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 60 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(a) and (b), page 98, as follows:

[Division I only]

“(a) Division I—In each sport, except football, men’s and women’s basketball, women’s gymnastics, women’s tennis and

women’s volleyball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time, including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen: further, the total number (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards in effect at any one time for all men’s sports, except football and basketball, shall not exceed the maximum limit of 70.

“(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time:

“(1) For men’s sports:

Total for all sports except football and basketball: 70”

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference and six members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the overall limitation of 70 in the Division I men’s equivalency sports.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 61 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), pages 98-99, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

“(c) Division I-A Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 40 on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes in any two-year period, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by an initial financial aid award. Such an initial award shall count toward the limit of 30 such awards for the following academic year.”

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University, and three other Pacific-10 Conference member institutions.

Intent: To establish a limit of 40 on the number of initial awards that may be made in any two-year period in Division I-A football and to eliminate the limit of 30 initial awards in any one year and the limit of 95 total awards in the sport.

Effective Date: August 1, 1985.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

NO. 62 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(d), page 99, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

“(d) Division I-AA Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made

to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 75 80 on the value **total number** of financial aid awards in effect the same year, including initial awards. *The maximum awards may not be distributed to more than 95 student-athletes.*"

Source: All seven members of the Southland Conference.

Intent: To increase the maximum awards limitation in Division I-AA football from 75 to 80 and to base the limitation on head count rather than equivalencies.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 63 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(d), page 99, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(d) Division I-AA Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 75 70 on the value of financial aid awards in effect the same year, including initial awards. The maximum awards may not be distributed to more than 95 student-athletes."

Source: All eight members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Intent: To reduce the maximum awards limitation in Division I-AA football from 75 to 70 (based on equivalencies).

Effective Date: August 1, 1985.

Action: Approved by Division I-AA. Subsequent motion to reconsider defeated.

NO. 64 MAXIMUM AWARDS—MEN'S ICE HOCKEY

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(a) and (b), page 98, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(a) Division I—In each sport, except football, men's and women's basketball, women's gymnastics, women's tennis and women's volleyball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time, including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen; further, the total number (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards in effect at any one time for all men's sports, except football, and basketball and ice hockey, shall not exceed the maximum limit of 70.

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time:

"(1) For men's sports:

Total for all sports except football, and basketball and ice hockey: 70

Ice Hockey 20"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5, pages 98-101, by adding new

paragraph (f), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) Division I Men's Ice Hockey—There shall be an annual limit of 20 on the total value (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year."

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Northwestern University, and two other Big Ten Conference member institutions.

Intent: To remove the permitted 20 grants-in-aid in men's ice hockey from the overall limit of 70 in equivalency sports in Division I.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 65 MULTIPLE SPORT PARTICIPANTS—WOMEN

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 6, page 101, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Section 6. Multiple Sport Participants.

[Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) unchanged.]

"(d) A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and practices or competes in field hockey and one or more other sports (other than basketball or women's volleyball) shall be counted in field hockey.

"(e) (d) A player in two or more sports (other than football, basketball, or women's volleyball or field hockey) shall be counted in one of the sports but need not be counted in the other, except that a player who practices or competes in both men's swimming and men's water polo at a Division I member institution shall be counted in the sport of men's swimming."

Source: University of California, Berkeley; Duke University; University of Iowa; Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; West Chester University of Pennsylvania, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To specify that a woman who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and practices or competes in field hockey and one or more other sports (other than basketball or women's volleyball) shall be counted in field hockey.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

Eligibility

NO. 66 INDIVIDUAL OUTSIDE COMPETITION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9, pages 23-26, by adding new

paragraph (d), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) The student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in his or her sport for the duration of the season if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he or she participates as an individual on his or her own behalf in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) in the sport, other than the official Olympic games and the final tryouts therefor, during the institution's intercollegiate season. However, the appropriate athletics authorities at the student-athlete's institution may grant the student-athlete permission for such outside participation on Sundays and during the institution's vacation periods that occur during the playing season of the particular sport."

Source: Babson College, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Franklin and Marshall College, University of New Hampshire, and West Chester University of Pennsylvania.

Intent: To restrict student-athletes from participating as "individuals" on their own behalf in outside competition during the season of the individual's intercollegiate sport, except as noted in the proposal.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 67 OUTSIDE BASKETBALL COMPETITION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(b), pages 23-25, by adding new subparagraph (3), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) A student-athlete may participate in noncollegiate amateur competition which occurs on the campus of the institution in which the student is enrolled during the academic year provided the student receives written permission for such competition from the athletics director of the institution. Such permission shall not be granted if such competition is contrary to any other regulations of this Association."

Source: Babson College, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Franklin and Marshall College, University of New Hampshire, and West Chester University of Pennsylvania.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to participate in outside basketball competition that occurs on campus during the academic year, with the permission of the institution's athletics director.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 68 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(c), page 76, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The student-athlete shall, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by the institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than 12 semester hours or 12 quarter hours (or a similar minimum academic load as determined by the NCAA Eligibility Committee in an institution which determines registration other than on a traditional semester or quarter hour basis or conducts a cooperative education program; or a minimum full-time graduate program as defined by the institution and approved by the NCAA Eligibility Committee in the event fewer than 12 hours are required, but which may be no fewer than eight hours); further, if the competition takes place between terms, the student-athlete shall have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition **or, for an entering or returning student, shall be registered for enrollment as a regular, full-time student for the immediate succeeding regular term.**"

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

Source: Babson College, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Franklin and Marshall College, University of New Hampshire, and West Chester University of Pennsylvania.

Intent: To require an entering or returning student-athlete to be registered for full-time enrollment in the succeeding regular term in order to be eligible to compete between terms.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 68-1 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 68, Bylaw 5-1-(c), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The student-athlete shall, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by the institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than 12 semester hours or 12 quarter hours (or a similar minimum academic load as determined by the NCAA Eligibility Committee in an institution which determines registration other than on a traditional semester or quarter hour basis or conducts a cooperative education program; or a minimum full-time graduate program as defined by the institution and approved by the NCAA Eligibility Committee in the event fewer than 12 hours are required, but which may be no fewer than eight hours); further, if the competition takes place between terms, the student-athlete shall have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition **or, for an entering or returning reentering student,**

shall be registered for enrollment as a regular, full-time student for the immediate succeeding regular term."

Source: Bates College.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 69 TRANSFER RULE—SUBVARSITY COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 79-83, by adding new subparagraph (11), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(11) A transfer student from a four-year institution or a transfer student from a junior college (who was a 2.000 qualifier if the transfer is to a Division I member institution) shall be eligible to compete only at the subvarsity level at the certifying institution prior to meeting the transfer eligibility requirements set forth in subparagraphs (7), (8) and (10). Such subvarsity competition shall count as a season of competition in the sport involved."

Source: Babson College, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Franklin and Marshall College, University of New Hampshire, and West Chester University of Pennsylvania.

Intent: To permit transfer students from four-year and two-year colleges the opportunity to participate immediately in their sport at the subvarsity level under the conditions noted in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III; defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 70 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(1), pages 76-77, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Any participation during a season in an intercollegiate sport, regardless of time, shall be counted as a season of competition in that sport. Cross country, indoor and outdoor track and field and sports that are sponsored during two separate seasons (e.g., fall and spring baseball) shall be considered separate sports."

Source: Eastern Connecticut State University, Fairfield University, Ithaca College, New Haven University, North Adams State College, St. John's University (New York), and four other Eastern College Athletic Conference member institutions.

Intent: To permit student-athletes in sports that have two separate seasons to participate during the traditional NCAA championship playing season in their sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer) without being adversely affected by any participation during the "off season."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 71 ELIGIBILITY—JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(k), pages 83-84, by adding new subparagraph (10), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(10) A transfer student from a junior college is not eligible for NCAA championship competition in a sport if the student-athlete has competed at the junior college in that sport during the same academic year."

Source: NCAA Council (Community and Junior College Relations Committee).

Intent: To prohibit a student-athlete from competing in an NCAA championship in a sport if the student has competed at the junior college in that same sport during the same academic year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 72 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m), pages 85-87, by adding new subparagraph (13), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(13) If the student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and the following conditions are met:

"(i) The student previously has never transferred from one four-year college to another four-year college;

"(ii) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance or the student's athletically related financial assistance was not renewed for the ensuing academic year at the previous institution;

"(iii) The student is in good academic standing and meets the satisfactory-progress requirements;

"(iv) The student's previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the student being granted an exception to the transfer residence requirement, and

"(v) The student is a participant in a sport other than football or men's basketball."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Central Washington University; Clarion University of Pennsylvania; Eastern Washington University; University of Montana; Montana State University, and 18 other member institutions.

Intent: To provide an exception to application of the transfer residence requirement for a transferring student-athlete who meets all five of the conditions specified in the proposal.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved by all divisions (152-128 in Division I, 82-42 in Division II, 90-71 in Division III).

NO. 73 TRANSFER RULE—NONRECRUITED STUDENT-ATHLETE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(10), page 86, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(10) If the student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:

"(i) The student-athlete was not recruited per O.I. 100,

"(ii) No athletically related financial assistance has been received by the student-athlete and

"(iii) The student-athlete has neither practiced (**except for limited preseason tryouts**) nor competed in intercollegiate athletics prior to transfer."

Source: Babson College, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Franklin and Marshall College, University of New Hampshire, and West Chester University of Pennsylvania.

Intent: To permit a waiver of the transfer residence requirement for a transferring nonrecruited student-athlete who may have participated to a limited degree in preseason tryouts in a sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III; defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 74 TRANSFER RULE—DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m), pages 85-87, by adding new subparagraph (13), as follows:

[Division III only]

"(13) If the student transfers to a Division III member institution from a Division I or Division II institution after competing in that sport at the previous institution provided the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the institution from which the student transferred."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit a student who transfers to a Division III institution from a Division I or Division II institution after competing at the previous institution to be immediately eligible if the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the previous institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 75 FIVE-YEAR RULE—WAIVERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(a), page 75, by adding new

subparagraph (1), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by it, shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting to permit student-athletes to participate in:

"(i) Official Pan American and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;

"(ii) Officially recognized training and competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts, or

"(iii) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate Group A and B members of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport)."

Source: Brown University, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Hofstra University, University of New Hampshire and Princeton University.

Intent: To authorize the Council to waive the Division I five-year rule for student-athletes who participate in official Pan American and Olympic training, tryouts and competition and in official tryouts and competition involving other national teams as specified in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 76 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d), pages 76-78, by adding new subparagraph (6), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(6) A student-athlete whose four seasons of intercollegiate competition include competition as a freshman prior to January 12, 1982, may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the institution if, in that freshman year of competition, the student-athlete did not participate in more than 20 percent of the institution's completed events in his or her sport or did not participate in more than two of the institution's completed events in that sport, whichever number is greater. Any contest (including a scrimmage) with outside competition is countable under this limitation. [Note: In applying the 20 percent limitation, any competition that results in a fractional portion of an event shall be rounded to the next whole number; e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule (5.4 games) shall be

considered as six games.] This provision shall be administered by the allied conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; University of Iowa; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Northwestern University; Ohio State University, and one other Big Ten Conference member institution.

Intent: To permit student-athletes who competed in not more than two events or 20 percent of the events in their sport, whichever is greater, during their freshman year prior to January 12, 1982, when freshman redshirting became permissible, to be granted an additional season of eligibility.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 77 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(3), pages 77-78, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport. *Participation in organized competition during time spent in the armed services of the United States, on official church missions or with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. government shall be excepted.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the exception provisions set forth in Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(3).

Effective Date: August 1, 1984; for those student-athletes first entering an NCAA member institution on or after that date.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 78 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(3), pages 77-78, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport, **provided, however, that in no event shall the student be charged with more than one year of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday.** Participation in organized competition during time spent in the armed services of the United States, on official church missions or with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. government shall be excepted."

Source: Brown University, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Holy Cross College, University of New Hampshire and St. Francis College (New York).

Intent: To specify that students whose eligibility is affected by this subparagraph shall not be charged with more than one season of eligibility in their sport during any one calendar year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 79 STUDENT-ATHLETE STATEMENT— GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(i), page 26, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) The student-athlete shall annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid *and*, amateur status **and involvement in organized gambling activities** under the governing legislation of this Association. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To include in the student-athlete statement a requirement that the student provide information related to any involvement in gambling activities.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 79-1.

NO. 79-1 STUDENT-ATHLETE STATEMENT— GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 79; Constitution 3-9-(i), as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) The student-athlete shall annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities **concerning intercollegiate athletic competition** under the governing legislation of this Association. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Action: Approved.

Championships

NO. 80 ESTABLISHMENT OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(a) and (b), page 151, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the Association had established **men's** championships prior to the 1979-80 academic year **and women's championships prior to the 1986-87 academic year.**

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

"(b) The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the Association had not established **men's** championships prior to the 1979-80 academic year **and women's championships prior to the 1986-87 academic year."**

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

Source: University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Northeastern University; Principia College; College of St. Catherine; University of the South; Stephens College, and 23 other member institutions.

Intent: To permit a women's championship in a sport in which no championship had been established prior to the 1979-80 academic year to be established prior to the 1986-87 academic year in accordance with the provisions of Executive Regulation 1-1-(a) rather than Executive Regulation 1-1-(b).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 81 ESTABLISHMENT OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(a) and (b), page 151, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the Association had established championships prior to the **1979-80 1982-83** academic year.

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

"(b) The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the Association had not established championships prior to the **1979-80 1982-83** academic year."

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, California University of Pennsylvania, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania and nine other member institutions.

Intent: To apply the provisions of Executive Regulation 1-1-(a) to all championships established prior to the 1982-83 academic year

rather than only to those established prior to the 1979-80 academic year and to apply the provisions of Executive Regulation 1-1-(b) to those championships established in 1982-83 or thereafter.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 82 CONTINUATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(d), page 151, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) If any championship falls below the required minimum sponsorship percentage set forth in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a)-(1) and (2) and Executive Regulations 1-1-(b)-(1) and (2) for two consecutive years, the championship automatically shall be discontinued, except that a championship in which net receipts exceed all expenses (including the transportation and per diem expenses as specified in Executive Regulation 1-11) shall be exempt from this provision. The determination of receipts and expenses shall be based upon a moving three-year average. *No championship established prior to the 1981-82 academic year shall be discontinued prior to the 1984 Olympic Games.* **National Collegiate Championships for which all divisions are eligible established prior to the 1982-83 academic year in a recognized Olympic sport shall be exempt from this provision."**

Source: Brown University; University of California, Los Angeles; California State University, Long Beach; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; University of Southern California; Stanford University, and one other member institution.

Intent: To exempt National Collegiate Championships established prior to the 1982-83 academic year in Olympic sports from being automatically discontinued if they fall below the required minimum sponsorship percentages set forth in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a) and 1-1-(b).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 82-1.

NO. 82-1 CONTINUATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Proposal No. 82; Executive Regulation 1-1-(d), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) If any championship falls below the required minimum sponsorship percentage set forth in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a)-(1) and (2) and Executive Regulations 1-1-(b)-(1) and (2) for two consecutive years, the championship automatically shall be discontinued, except that a championship in which net receipts exceed all expenses (including the transportation and per diem expenses as specified in Executive Regulation 1-11) shall be exempt

from this provision. The determination of receipts and expenses shall be based upon a moving three-year average. National Collegiate Championships for which all divisions are eligible established prior to the 1982-83 academic year in a recognized Olympic sport shall be exempt from this provision **through the 1987-88 academic year, provided that at least 50 member institutions sponsor the sport.**"

NO. 83 DIVISION II MEN'S AND WOMEN'S INDOOR TRACK CHAMPIONSHIPS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 90, by adding the following:
[Division II only]

"National Collegiate Division II Men's Indoor Track Championships"

"National Collegiate Division II Women's Indoor Track Championships"

Source: All 14 members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To establish National Collegiate Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships.

Effective Date: Immediately; first championships to be conducted in 1984-85 academic year.

Action: Approved by Division II. First was withdrawn; delegate objected to withdrawal. Subsequent motion to rescind Division II's action was defeated.

NO. 84 DIVISION III MEN'S AND WOMEN'S INDOOR TRACK CHAMPIONSHIPS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 91, by adding the following:
[Division III only]

"National Collegiate Division III Men's Indoor Track Championships"

"National Collegiate Division III Women's Indoor Track Championships"

Source: NCAA Division III Steering Committee.

Intent: To establish National Collegiate Division III Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships.

Effective Date: Immediately; first championships to be conducted in 1984-85 academic year.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 85 DIVISION III ICE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 91, by adding the following:
[Division III only]

"National Collegiate Division III Men's Ice Hockey Championship"

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Division III Men's Ice Hockey Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately; first championship to be conducted in March 1984.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 86 DIVISION III FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b), page 116, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) A member of Division I may petition to be classified in Division I-A, Division I-AA, Division II or Division III in football, and a member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in football. If the petition is granted, the institution shall be entitled to vote in the division in which it is classified in football on legislative issues directly affecting football. **A member of Division I or Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship, except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1983, shall remain eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship.** In addition, a member of Division I may petition to be classified in Division II or Division III in any one women's sport, and a member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in any one women's sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that a member of Division I or Division II that is initially classified in Division III in football after September 1, 1983, shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 87 DIVISION III FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b), page 116, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) A member of Division I may petition to be classified in Division I-A, Division I-AA, Division II or Division III in football, and a member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in football. If the petition is granted, the institution shall be entitled to vote in the division in which it is classified in football on legislative issues directly affecting football. **A member of Division I that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship, except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to Sep-**

tember 1, 1983, shall remain eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship. A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years. In addition, a member of Division I may petition to be classified in Division II or Division III in any one women's sport, and a member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in any one women's sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee.)

Intent: To specify that a member of Division I that is initially classified in Division III in football after September 1, 1983, shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship and that a member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 88 SEEDING FOR TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 2, pages 152-155, by adding new paragraph (r), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(r) In team sports championships, 25 percent of the championship field or four teams, whichever is greater, shall be seeded and placed in the bracket without regard to geographical location."

Source: Boise State University; California University of Pennsylvania; Clarion University of Pennsylvania; Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Stephens College, and 13 other member institutions.

Intent: To require that 25 percent of the championship field or four teams, whichever is greater, be seeded in team sports championships without regard to geographical location.

Effective Date: September 1, 1984.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 88-1 SEEDING FOR TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Proposal No. 88; Executive Regulation 1-2-(r), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(r) In team sports women's basketball and women's volleyball championships, at least 25 percent of the championship field or at least four teams, whichever is greater, shall be seeded and placed in the bracket without regard to geographical location."

Source: San Diego State University.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 89 AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION-DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 6-(b)-(2)-(i), page 161, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) In order to be eligible for automatic qualification into the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, an allied conference must have been a member of the Association for three consecutive academic years, provided it is composed of institutions which have been members of Division I more than five years. A conference which contains one or more institutions that have been members of Division I for less than five consecutive academic years is required to wait five years before becoming eligible for automatic qualification. If an established Division I conference currently receiving automatic qualification elects a new conference member and such institution has been a member of Division I for less than five years, such conference will not be **shall remain eligible for automatic qualification in Division I men's basketball until all of its members have fulfilled the five-year requirement. The new member shall not represent the conference as the automatic qualifier until it has been a member of Division I for at least three consecutive academic years."**

Source: California State University, Long Beach; Eastern Washington University; Gonzaga University; Idaho State University; University of Montana; Northern Arizona University, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To permit an established Division I conference currently receiving automatic qualification in men's basketball to add a new member that has been a member of Division I for less than five years and retain the conference's automatic-qualification privilege and to prohibit the new conference member from representing the conference until the institution has been a Division I member for at least three years.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 90 AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION-DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 6-(b)-(2)-(i), page 161, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) In order to be eligible for automatic qualification into the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, an allied conference must have been a member of the Association for three consecutive academic years, provided it is composed of institutions which have been members of Division I more than five years. A conference which contains one or more institutions that have been members of Division I for less than five consecutive academic years is required

to wait five years before becoming eligible for automatic qualification. If an established Division I conference **composed of eight or more members** and currently receiving automatic qualification elects a new conference member and such institution has been a member of Division I for less than five years, such conference will not be eligible for automatic qualification in Division I men's basketball until all of its members have fulfilled the five-year requirement. **However, if an established Division I conference with fewer than eight members, currently receiving automatic qualification, elects a new conference member and such institution has been a member of Division I for less than five years, such conference will continue to be eligible for automatic qualification in Division I men's basketball.**

Source: All seven members of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit an established Division I conference with fewer than eight members that is currently receiving automatic qualification in men's basketball to expand its membership to a maximum of eight and retain the conference's automatic-qualification privilege.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 91 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the number of Division I conferences meeting the criteria for automatic qualification for the men's basketball championship has increased significantly over the past several years; and

"Whereas, there continues to be a need to accommodate those automatic-qualifying conferences and at the same time accommodate more at-large berths in the championship tournament; and

"Whereas, the National Association of Basketball Coaches has recommended increasing the size of the tournament; and

"Whereas, several NCAA committees have recommended that the size of the field for the Division I Men's Basketball Championship be increased;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee increase the size of the Division I men's basketball tournament field to 64 teams for the 1985 tournament; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee be directed to study ways to make the expansion of the tournament permanent within this structure."

Source: All eight members of the Midwestern City Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 92 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

[Division I-AA football only]

"Whereas, the current playoff format for the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship involves teams in a total of 11

playoff and championship games that extend over four consecutive Saturdays beginning the last Saturday in November; and

"Whereas, the playoff format extends the season by three or four games for the teams involved in the championship (three if the teams draw a first-round bye); and

"Whereas, Division I-AA colleges and universities are committed to maintaining the clear priority of their academic purposes and calendars; and

"Whereas, a significant number of presidents and chancellors of Division I-AA colleges and universities are concerned about the conflict between their academic calendars and the current schedule of postseason championship play in football; and

"Whereas, a significant number of presidents and chancellors of I-AA colleges and universities believe that a football season of 14 or 15 games places excessive demands on their students who play football and interferes with the academic priority;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA give careful consideration to revising the present Division I-AA Football Championship format and calendar with a new format and calendar to begin January 1, 1986."

Source: Colgate University; Indiana State University, Terre Haute; North Carolina A&T State University; University of Richmond; South Carolina State College; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and one other member institution.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA.

NO. 93 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I MEN'S ICE HOCKEY

[Division I only]

"Whereas, there are 35 Division I men's ice hockey teams competing in only three current Division I conferences, plus four independent (unaffiliated) teams for a total of 39 Division I men's ice hockey teams; and

"Whereas, men's ice hockey is a unique sport in Division I, since its championship is the only one continued under the provisions of Executive Regulation 1-1-(d); and

"Whereas, the procedure by which the eight teams are selected to compete for the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship is based, in part, upon geographic considerations despite the fact that the teams are not evenly distributed geographically; and

"Whereas, Executive Regulation 1-3-(h) provides that the conference champion be the first representative of the allied conference selected, thus recognizing selection based upon conference affiliation;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the allocation of at-large bids recommended by the Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee in May 1983, and accepted by the Executive Committee, be modified to assign one additional at-large championship bid to the East region, one at-large championship bid to the Central Collegiate Hockey Association and one at-large championship bid to the Western Collegiate Hockey Association; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the selection of teams to utilize these

at-large championship bids continue to be carried out by the Division I subcommittee of the NCAA Men's Ice Hockey Committee (with three at-large teams from the East region, one at-large team from the CCHA and one at-large team from the WCHA); and

"Be It Further Resolved, that Division I men's ice hockey teams in the West region that are not members of the CCHA or WCHA may be selected to an at-large bid via either the assigned CCHA at-large bid or the assigned WCHA at-large bid; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that this resolution shall be effective only for the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championships for 1984 and 1985."

Source: All 11 members of the Central Collegiate Hockey Association.

Action: Approved by Division I.

Recruiting

NO. 94 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(b), page 50, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) All contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian off campus for purposes of recruitment **to institutions that award financial aid based on athletic ability** shall be made by institutional staff members. Such in-person, off-campus contact by representatives of an institution's athletic interests is prohibited."

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To exempt institutions that do not offer athletic grants-in-aid from the requirement that off-campus recruiting contacts shall be made only by institutional staff members.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 95 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(b), page 50, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) All contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian off campus for purposes of recruitment **to institutions that subscribe to the National Letter of Intent** shall be made by institutional staff members. Such in-person, off-campus contact by representatives of an institution's athletic interests is prohibited."

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To exempt institutions that do not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent from the requirement that off-campus recruiting contacts shall be made only by institutional staff members.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 96 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(b), page 50, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) All contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian off campus for purposes of recruitment shall be made by institutional staff members. Such in-person, off-campus contact by representatives of an institution's athletic interests is prohibited. **The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions that do not award financial aid based in any degree on athletic ability.**"

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To authorize the NCAA Council to waive the requirement that off-campus recruiting contacts shall be made only by institutional staff members for institutions that do not award financial aid based on athletic ability.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 97 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1), pages 48-49, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) Three such contacts (at sites other than the prospect's educational institution) per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by each member institution.

[Subparagraph (i) unchanged.]

"(ii) Subsequent to the occasion of the quiet period surrounding the National Letter of Intent signing date, there shall be no limit on such contacts with the prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian by the institution with which the prospect has signed; further, subsequent to the quiet period surrounding the National Letter of Intent signing date, there shall be no limit on such contacts by a national service academy to which the prospect has applied for admission.

[Subparagraph (iii) and subparagraphs (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of football only during the period between December 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and March 1, **except**

as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures utilizing acceptance dates subsequent to the March 1 deadline.

"(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between September 1 and November 1 and the period between March 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and May 15, except that no member of a Division I institution's coaching staff shall contact a prospect during the period beginning with the Thursday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship and ending at noon on the Tuesday after the game as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6). [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, contacts with prospective student-athletes being recruited to participate on a member institution's women's intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this subparagraph.]

"(6) There shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletic interests during the following time periods:

"(i) In any sport, during the period beginning 48 hours immediately prior to the initial date on which the prospective student-athlete is eligible to sign a National Letter of Intent, and ending 36 hours after the signing date; and

"(ii) In the sport of basketball, during the period beginning with the Thursday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship game and ending at noon on the Tuesday after the game."

Source: NCAA Council (Collegiate Commissioners Association).

Intent: To prohibit all in-person recruiting contacts in all sports during the period surrounding the first date on which the prospective student-athlete is eligible to sign a National Letter of Intent and in the sport of basketball during the semifinal and final rounds of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved in part. Portion applying to "quiet period" surrounding National Letter of Intent signing date defeated by Division I (136-136; tie vote fails) and Division II. Portion applying to Division I Men's Basketball Championship approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 98 EMPLOYMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL COACH

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b), page 48, by adding new subparagraph (3), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(3) The employment of a high school or junior college coach (who remains associated with the high school or junior college in a coaching capacity) as a member of the coaching staff of a member institution shall be permitted."

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions II and III Steering Committees).

Intent: To permit a member institution to employ a high school or junior college coach as a member of its coaching staff.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III.

NO. 99 BASKETBALL RECRUITING PERIODS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), pages 49-50, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period **beginning July 1 and ending July 31, the period beginning September 1 and November 1 ending October 10** and the period **beginning March 1** (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and **ending May 15**, except that no member of a Division I institution's coaching staff shall contact a prospect during the period beginning with the Thursday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship game and ending at noon on the Tuesday after the game. [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, contacts with prospective student-athletes being recruited to participate on a member institution's women's intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this subparagraph.]"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(a), page 52, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of basketball during the period **between July 1 and August 1 and the period between beginning December 1 and March 1 ending February 28** (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest)."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To allow in-person, off-campus recruiting contact (instead of only evaluation) with a prospective student-athlete in the sport of basketball during the month of July, and to end the fall contact period in the sport October 10.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 100 RECRUITING CONTACT AND EVALUATION PERIODS—BASKETBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), pages 49-50, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between September 1 and *November 1 October 10* and the period between March 1 (or the date of completion of the prospective student-athlete’s final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and May 15, except that no member of a Division I institution’s coaching staff shall contact a prospect during the period beginning with the Thursday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Men’s Basketball Championship game and ending at noon on the Tuesday after the game. [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, contacts with prospective student-athletes being recruited to participate on a member institution’s women’s intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this subparagraph.]”

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(a), page 52, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of basketball during the period between *July 1 June 15* and August 1 and the period between *December 1 and March 1* (or the prospective student-athlete’s **initial** and final high school or junior college contests).”

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions I and II Steering Committees).

Intent: To eliminate the October 10-31 time period from the contact period and add the June 15-30 time period to the evaluation period in the sport of basketball for Divisions I and II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 101 RECRUITING CONTACT AND EVALUATION PERIODS—WOMEN’S BASKETBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), pages 49-50, as follows:

[Division I only]

“(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between September 1 and November 1 and the period between March 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete’s final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and May 15, except that no member of a Division I institution’s coaching staff shall contact a prospect during the period beginning with the Thursday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Men’s Basketball Championship game and ending at noon on the Tuesday after the game. [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, *1985 1984*, contacts with prospective student-athletes being recruited to

participate on a member institution’s women’s intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this subparagraph.]”

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3, pages 51-52, as follows:

[Division I only]

“Section 3. Evaluation Periods. The involvement of institutional staff members or representatives of athletic interests in off-campus scouting activities designed to evaluate the academic standing and playing ability of prospective student-athletes in the sports of basketball and football shall be restricted to the permissible periods for in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts in those sports except as follows: [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, *1985 1984*, such scouting activities related to prospective student-athletes being recruited to participate on a member institution’s women’s intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this section.]”

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To apply the contact and evaluation period restrictions to recruiting prospects for women’s basketball teams beginning August 1, 1984, rather than August 1, 1985, for Division I.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 102 WOMEN’S BASKETBALL RECRUITING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a), pages 48-50, by adding new subparagraph (6), as follows:

[Division I only]

“(6) No such in-person contact shall be made on or off the institution’s campus by a member of a Division I institution’s coaching staff concerning a prospective student-athlete in the sport of women’s basketball during the period beginning with the Wednesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Women’s Basketball Championship game and ending at noon on the Monday after the game.”

Source: NCAA Council (Women’s Basketball Coaches Association).

Intent: To prohibit any in-person on- or off-campus recruiting in the sport of women’s basketball by a member of a Division I coaching staff during the semifinal and final rounds of the Division I Women’s Basketball Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 103 FOOTBALL RECRUITING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(4), page 49, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A and I-AA football only, divided vote]

"(4) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of football only during the period between December 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and March 1, **except that no member of a Division I institution's coaching staff shall contact a prospect in person on or off the institution's campus during the period beginning at 12:01 a.m. on the day of registration at the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association and ending at 12:01 a.m. on the day after the completion of that convention.** The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures utilizing acceptance dates subsequent to the March 1 deadline."

Source: NCAA Council (American Football Coaches Association).

Intent: To prohibit any in-person on- or off-campus football recruiting by a member of a Division I institution's coaching staff during the American Football Coaches Association annual convention.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA; application begins with 1985 AFCA Convention.

NO. 104 FOOTBALL EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(b), page 52, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football only, divided vote]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football only during the period between August 1 and December 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest), *as well as the month of May.*"

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California, and two other Pacific-10 Conference member institutions.

Intent: To eliminate the month of May from the evaluation period for the sport of football for Divisions I and II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football-playing members.

NO. 105 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 8-(k), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(k) If an institution schedules any regular-season home games in any given sport at a site located in a community other than its own *and in the same state*, the host institution may provide a maximum of three complimentary admissions to one such game

only for the exclusive use of admitting a prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect. Tournament and postseason games are excluded. Further, the institution shall not arrange or permit any other entertainment or payment of any expenses, including transportation."

Source: University of Colorado; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma State University.

Intent: To delete the requirement that an off-campus, regular-season home game must be in the state in which the institution is located in order to permit the host institution to provide complimentary admission to prospective student-athletes.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved by all divisions (Division I vote 138-114).

NO. 106 COMPLIMENTARY MEAL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 8-(f), page 57, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(f) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at the prospect's own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During each such visit, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event for the exclusive use of admitting the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit. In addition, **a Division I member that does not offer athletically related financial aid or a Division II or III member institution may provide a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities during such a visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip.**"

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To permit a Division I institution that does not offer athletically related financial aid to provide a complimentary meal in its on-campus dining facilities to a prospect visiting the campus at the prospect's own expense, without the visit being considered an expense-paid visit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 107 COMPLIMENTARY MEAL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 8-(f), page 57, as follows:
[Division I-AA football only]

"(f) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at the prospect's own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During each such visit, the institution may not

pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event for the exclusive use of admitting the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit. In addition, **a Division I-AA (football prospect only), a Division II or a Division III member** may provide a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities during such a visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To permit a Division I-AA institution to provide a complimentary meal in its on-campus dining facilities to a football prospect visiting the campus at the prospect's own expense, without the visit being considered an expense-paid visit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA. First approved (41-39); then defeated (38-49) after motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 108 RECRUITING CONTACT-ALL-STAR GAME

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2, pages 48-51, by adding new paragraph (e), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(e) No in-person contact shall be made by members of the coaching staff of a member institution on or off its campus with a prospective student-athlete at the site of practice or competition for a high school all-star game outside of the permissible contact periods in the sports of football [per Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(4)] and basketball [per Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(5)]."

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Intent: To prohibit in-person contact outside of the permissible contact periods with prospective student-athletes in the sports of football and basketball at the site of practice or competition for a high school all-star game by members of the coaching staff of a member institution on or off its campus.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

Membership and Classification

NO. 109 DIVISION I CRITERIA

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(b), page 120, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of eight varsity intercollegiate sports involv-

ing all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution which was a member of Division I as of December 4, 1981, shall conform to this criterion no later than September 1, 1983. An institution which applies for Division I membership subsequent to December 4, 1981, shall meet this criterion prior to making application. An institution desiring to be a member of Division I that has affiliated its women's program with the NCAA in accordance with Bylaw 5-6-(a)-(2) shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1986; seven varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1987, and eight varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1988. Such sponsorship shall be based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1, pages 120-123, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(c) The NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the Division I minimum women's sports sponsorship provision set forth in paragraph (b) of this section in the following circumstances:

"(1) The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received in the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1; any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 23. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request.

"(2) The institution provides data which demonstrate that the ratio of male to female enrollment prohibits the offering of the required number of sports for women, or

"(3) The institution provides data which demonstrate insufficient student interest in establishing or maintaining the requisite number of teams.

"(4) If the Council votes to reject the institution's request, the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(d) shall become effective."

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference and five other member institutions.

Intent: To establish the sponsorship of eight varsity intercollegiate sports for women as a criterion for membership in Division I and to authorize the NCAA Council to grant exceptions under the circumstances specified in the proposal.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986; Division I institutions would be required to sponsor six women's sports during the 1985-86 academic

year, seven women's sports during the 1986-87 academic year and eight women's sports during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter.

Action: Approved by Division I (141-126).

NO. 110 DIVISION II CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(b), page 124, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division II, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division II that has affiliated its women's program with the NCAA in accordance with Bylaw 5-6-(a)-(2) shall sponsor a minimum of five varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1986, and six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1987, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To establish the sponsorship of six varsity intercollegiate sports for women as a criterion for membership in Division II and to establish exceptions for institutions that sponsor athletics programs for only one sex.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986; Division II institutions would be required to sponsor five women's sports during the 1985-86 academic year and six women's sports during the 1986-87 academic year and thereafter.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 110-1 DIVISION II CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 110; Bylaw 11-2, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(c) The NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the Division II minimum women's sports sponsorship provision set forth in paragraph (b) of this section in the following circumstances:

"(1) The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received in the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1; any request

received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 23. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request.

"(2) The institution provides data which demonstrate that the ratio of male to female enrollment prohibits the offering of the required number of sports for women, or

"(3) The institution provides data which demonstrate insufficient student interest in establishing or maintaining the requisite number of teams.

"(4) If the Council votes to reject the institution's request, the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(d) shall become effective."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 111 DIVISION II CRITERIA

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(b), page 124, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division II, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division II that has affiliated its women's program with the NCAA in accordance with Bylaw 5-6-(a)-(2) shall sponsor a minimum of five varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1987, and six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1988. Such sponsorship shall be based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2, pages 123-124, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(c) The NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the Division II minimum women's sports sponsorship provision set forth in paragraph (b) of this section in the following circumstances:

"(1) The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received in the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1; any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 23. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request.

"(2) The institution provides data which demon-

strate that the ratio of male to female enrollment prohibits the offering of the required number of sports for women, or

"(3) The institution provides data which demonstrate insufficient student interest in establishing or maintaining the requisite number of teams.

"(4) If the Council votes to reject the institution's request, the provisions of Bylaw 10-1(d) shall become effective."

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, California University of Pennsylvania, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and three other member institutions.

Intent: To establish the sponsorship of six varsity intercollegiate sports for women as a criterion for membership in Division II and to authorize the NCAA Council to grant exceptions under the circumstances specified in the proposal.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987; Division II institutions would be required to sponsor five women's sports during the 1986-87 academic year and six women's sports during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter.

Action: Approved by Division II as amended by No. 111-1.

NO. 111-1 DIVISION II CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 111-A; Bylaw 11-2-(b), as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division II, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division II that has affiliated its women's program with the NCAA in accordance with Bylaw 5-6-(a)-(2) shall sponsor a minimum of five varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1987, and six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1988. Such sponsorship shall be based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 112 DIVISION III CRITERIA-ACADEMIC HONOR AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(4)-(i), page 125, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(i) Academic Honor Awards, which may be offered only to (a) a student who was in the upper 20 percent of the high school graduating class or who, if the student's high school class rank is unavailable, earned an accumulative high school grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or achieved a minimum ACT score of 24 or a minimum SAT score of 1,050, or (b) a student who does not qualify under (a) and who has completed at least one academic year in college and has earned an accumulative grade-point average of 3.300 (on a 4.000 scale) for all academic work completed during the student's collegiate enrollment resulting in degree credits at the awarding institution. Such awards shall be part of the institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships, awarded independently of athletic interests and in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution."

Source: All six members of the College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To delete the requirement that a student's high school class rank must be unavailable before a minimum ACT or SAT score may be utilized in determining whether the student may receive an "academic honor award" without consideration of the recipient's need.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 113 MEMBERSHIP EFFECTIVE DATE

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 2-(a)-(2), page 109, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) The secretary shall determine whether the applying institution is accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies. If the institution is not so accredited, the application shall be disapproved. If, however, the institution is so accredited, it shall be deemed to have satisfied the Association's requirement of acceptable academic standards; and its application shall be considered by the Classification Committee in accordance with Bylaw 10-2. The secretary then shall refer the application to the Council for consideration. A favorable vote by two-thirds of the Council members present and voting shall elect the applicant to membership, effective the following September 1, the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 2-(f), page 110, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) Reaffiliation of Women's Program. If an institution removes its women's program from affiliation with the Association and subsequently applies to reestablish its affiliation, such application shall be approved by the NCAA Council. A favorable vote by two-thirds of the Council members present and voting shall

reaffiliate the institution's women's program, effective the following September 1, **the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first.**"

C. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 1-(f)-(4), page 115, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) If the division votes to admit the institution as a member of that division, such classification shall become effective in accordance with Bylaw 9-2-(a)-(2) for a new member of the Association, or the September 1 following the Convention (**or the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first**) for an institution seeking multidivision classification or change of division membership."

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

D. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 2-(a), page 115, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) At the time of application, a prospective member shall designate the membership division it desires and its preferred football classification. The membership application shall be considered by the Classification Committee, which shall determine the division for which the prospective member qualifies under the applicable criteria. The application then shall be submitted for possible election to membership, effective the following September 1, **the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first**, in accordance with the provisions of Constitution 4 and Bylaw 9-2."

E. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 3-(d)-(1), page 116, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) If the Classification Committee determines that the member has met all applicable membership criteria of the division as set forth in Bylaw 11 and has operated in conformity for a period of two years preceding June 1 with all other bylaw requirements of the division as they pertain to the sport in question, the Classification Committee shall declare the applicant eligible to participate in said sport in the division effective the September 1 which the applicant selects as its effective date, **the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first.** The institution shall continue to be classified in that division for that sport for a minimum of three years."

F. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 117, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) If the Classification Committee determines that the member has met all applicable membership criteria, as set forth in Bylaw 11, of the division to which it intends to transfer and has

operated in conformity for a period of two years preceding June 1 with all other bylaw requirements of the division, the member shall be transferred to the new division effective the September 1 following submission of the petition (**or the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first**). The institution shall continue to be classified in that division for a minimum of three years."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that changes in membership status become effective on September 1, the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

Amateurism

NO. 114 AMATEURISM—NAME OR PICTURE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(e), page 11, by adding new subparagraph (3), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) It is permissible for a student-athlete's name or picture to appear in books, articles or other publications, films, videotapes or other types of electronic reproduction related to sport skill demonstration, analysis or instruction provided such print and electronic media productions are for educational purposes, there is no indication that the student-athlete expressly or implicitly endorses a commercial product or service, the student-athlete shall not receive under any circumstances any remuneration or expenses for such participation, and the student-athlete has signed a release statement that conditions the use of the student-athlete's name or image in a manner consistent with the requirements of this subparagraph and has filed a copy of the statement with the member institution in which the student is enrolled."

Source: California University of Pennsylvania; College of St. Catherine; Swarthmore College; University of Texas, Austin; West Chester University of Pennsylvania; University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, and 24 other member institutions.

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete's eligibility is not jeopardized by the use of the student's name or picture in an educational sport skill demonstration under the circumstances specified in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 115 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSION

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3), page 13, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(3) Awarding complimentary tickets in excess of four per student-athlete per contest and awarding complimentary tickets to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant, except as provided in **Constitution 3-1-(h)-(6)** and the bylaws. Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated by the student-athlete and who have identified themselves and signed a receipt therefor. The student-athlete may not receive any payment from any source for the complimentary tickets and may not exchange them for any item of value.”

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h), page 14, by adding new subparagraph (6), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(6) Admission for each student-athlete to all of the institution's regular-season home intercollegiate athletic contests. Actual tickets for events cannot be issued. Institutions may use a printed student-athlete pass or a certified gate list of names of all student-athletes. Institutions must require proof of identity by student-athletes upon admission to events.”

Source: Bradley University; Central Michigan University; Eastern Illinois University; University of Northern Iowa; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and University of Texas, Austin.

Intent: To permit an institution to provide admission for all student-athletes to the institution's regular-season home intercollegiate athletic contests in all sports.

Effective Date: August 1, 1984.

Action: Approved.

NO. 116 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—PRESS CONFERENCES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h), page 14, by adding new subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(2) Actual and necessary expenses incurred by a student-athlete to attend off-campus press conferences or sportswriters luncheons associated with the institution's intercollegiate athletics program in which the student is

directly involved, provided the site of the press conference or sportswriters luncheon is within the state in which the member institution is located or at a distance not to exceed 100 miles if outside that state.”

Source: Babson College, Columbia University, Fairfield University, Franklin and Marshall College, University of New Hampshire, and West Chester University of Pennsylvania.

Intent: To permit payment of expenses by a member institution for student-athletes to attend press conferences or sportswriters luncheons associated with the institution's intercollegiate athletics program.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 117 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—WORLD UNIVERSITY GAMES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(3), page 14, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(3) Actual and necessary expenses for participation in national championship events, Olympic and , Pan American and World University Games qualifying competition or bona fide amateur competition during the Christmas and spring vacations as listed on the institution's official calendar;”

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Arizona State University; University of California, Los Angeles; California State University, Fullerton; University of Georgia; University of Utah, and one other member institution.

Intent: To permit institutions to provide actual and necessary expenses for student-athletes to participate in World University Games qualifying competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 118 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—ATHLETIC CAREER COUNSELING

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(4), page 14, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(4) Identified benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics which may be financed by the institution are tutoring expenses, athletic medical insurance and , death and dismemberment insurance for travel connected with intercollegiate competition and practice, and counseling about a future professional athletic career through a three-person panel appointed by the institution from among its full-time employees employed outside the athletics department and identified to the NCAA national office.”

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Player Agents).

Intent: To permit a member institution to appoint a three-member panel from among its staff members employed outside of the athletics department to counsel student-athletes about future professional athletic careers and to require that the members of the panel be identified to the NCAA national office.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 118-1.

NO. 118-1 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES-ATHLETIC CAREER COUNSELING

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 118; Constitution 3-1-(h)-(4), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Identified benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics which may be financed by the institution are tutoring expenses, athletic medical insurance, death and dismemberment insurance for travel connected with intercollegiate athletic competition and practice, and counseling about a future professional athletic career through a three-person panel appointed by the institution's chief executive officer (or his or her designated representative from outside the athletics department) from among its full-time employees employed outside the athletics department and identified to the NCAA national office."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

NO. 119 DISABILITY INSURANCE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1, pages 9-16, by adding new paragraph (j), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(j) A student-athlete who has completed at least two years of eligibility in an intercollegiate sport (including at least one year at the member institution in which the individual is currently enrolled) may borrow against his or her future earnings potential as a professional athlete from an established, accredited commercial lending institution exclusively for the purpose of purchasing insurance (with no cash surrender value) against a disabling injury that would prevent the individual from pursuing a professional athletic career. The student-athlete shall report any such transactions to the member institution and shall file copies of the loan documents and insurance policy with the member institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Player Agents).

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to borrow under the specified

conditions against his or her future earnings potential as a professional athlete in order to purchase insurance against a disabling injury that would prevent the individual from pursuing a professional athletic career and to require the student-athlete to report the transaction to and file appropriate documents with the member institution he or she attends.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 120 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES-SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(1), page 14, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Actual and necessary expenses on intercollegiate athletic trips, reasonable trips (within the state in which the member institution is located or a distance not to exceed 100 miles if outside that state) to practice sites other than those of the institution, or to transport a team a reasonable distance (not to exceed 100 miles) to an off-campus site for a postseason team award or recognition meeting; however, it shall be permissible to provide expenses when a team is invited by the President of the United States or by the governor of the state in which the institution is located to be accorded special recognition in either the national or state capital;"

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To specify that it is permissible for an institution to pay the expenses of a team to travel to the national or state capital when invited by the President or governor for special recognition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 120-1.

NO. 120-1 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES-SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 120; Constitution 3-1-(h)-(1), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Actual and necessary expenses on intercollegiate athletic trips, reasonable trips (within the state in which the member institution is located or a distance not to exceed 100 miles if outside that state) to practice sites other than those of the institution, or to transport a team a reasonable distance (not to exceed 100 miles) to an off-campus site for a postseason team award or recognition meeting; however, it shall be permissible to provide expenses when a team is invited by the President of the United States or by the governor of the state in which the institution is located to be accorded special recognition in either the national or state capital;"

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 121 PERMISSIBLE AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i)-(1)-(i), pages 14-15, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) Institutional awards for recognition of intercollegiate athletic participation may include letter sweaters, letter jackets, sports blazers and blankets with appropriate institutional insignia or letter.; watches or rings or equivalent personalized awards with institutional insignia or comparable identification; **pen and pencil sets, cameras, binoculars, clock radios and luggage with institutional insignia or comparable identification**, as well as scrolls, photographs and plaques. In addition, senior awards as listed above may be presented. Merchandise items which cannot be properly personalized (e.g., gift certificates, appliances, television sets) shall be prohibited."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To add the specified items to the list of awards a student-athlete is permitted to receive provided the items are permanently marked to identify the institution and the award.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 143 BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b)-(1), page 70, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(1) Basketball—The last Friday in November for members of Division I, and the *next-to-last Friday in November* **immediately preceding Thanksgiving** for members of Divisions II and III, except as provided in Bylaw 3-2-(e)."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II and Division III Steering Committees).

Intent: To specify that the first basketball contest for Division II and Division III member institutions shall not be played prior to the Friday preceding Thanksgiving.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III after motion to change order of business approved.

NO. 144 BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b)-(1), page 70, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) Basketball—The *last fourth* Friday in November for members of Division I, and the next-to-last Friday in November for

members of Divisions II and III, except as provided in Bylaw 3-2-(e)."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To specify that the first basketball contest for Division I member institutions shall not be played prior to the fourth Friday in November.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I after motion to change order of business approved.

General

NO. 154 ETHICAL CONDUCT—GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, pages 21-22, by adding new paragraph (b), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not knowingly provide information to assist individuals involved in organized gambling activities, solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team, accept a bet on any team representing the institution or participate in any gambling involving intercollegiate athletics through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit staff members of the athletics department of a member institution from providing information to individuals involved in organized gambling activities and from gambling on intercollegiate athletics contests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 154-1 after motion to change order of business approved.

NO. 154-1 ETHICAL CONDUCT—GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 154, Constitution 3-6-(b), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not knowingly provide information to assist individuals involved in organized gambling activities **concerning intercollegiate athletic competition**, solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team, accept a bet on any team representing the institution or participate in any gambling involving intercollegiate

athletics through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Action: Approved.

NO. 155 GAMBLING AND BRIBERY

A. Recommended Policies: Amend Policy 8, Section 3, pages 181-182, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 3. Institutional rules should provide that any student (athlete or nonathlete) shall be expelled from college **and any staff member shall be terminated as an employee** for failure to report a solicitation to be a party to sports bribery; further, institutional regulations should provide that a student shall be expelled **or a staff member shall be terminated** if the student individual becomes an agent of the gambling industry through the process of distributing handicap information or handling bets. [Note: Institutions should encourage local authorities to enact and enforce laws prohibiting this type of activity on the part of any citizen.]"

B. Recommended Policies: Amend Policy 8, pages 181-182, by adding new Section 4, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. Institutional rules should provide for the **termination of employment for life of any staff member who knowingly continues association with known gamblers or bookmakers after being advised by the institution's chief executive officer to discontinue such association.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To encourage member institutions to terminate staff members who fail to report solicitations to be parties to sports bribery or become agents of the gambling industry and to encourage institutions to terminate for life staff members who continue association with known gamblers or bookmakers after being warned by the institution's chief executive officer.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved after motion to change order of business approved.

NO. 156 INFRACTIONS—COUNCIL APPEAL PROCEDURE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 5, pages 189-190, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

[Paragraph (a) unchanged.]

"(b) The member then shall have the right to give written notice of appeal of the committee's findings **[subject to the conditions of paragraph (c)]**, the penalty, or both, to the NCAA

Council. To be considered by the Council, the notice of appeal must be received by the NCAA executive director not later than 15 calendar days from the date the member institution received the committee's report. The member's notice of appeal shall contain a statement of the date the committee's report was received by the chief executive officer, and a statement indicating whether the institution will be represented before the Council at the time the appeal is considered.

"(c) **Determinations of fact and violations arrived at by the Committee on Infractions shall not be set aside on appeal, except upon a showing that: (i) The committee's finding clearly is contrary to the evidence presented to the committee; (ii) the facts found by the committee do not constitute a violation of the Association's rules, or (iii) a procedural error affected the reliability of the information that was utilized to support the committee's finding.**"

"(c) (d) If any current or former institutional staff member participates in a hearing before the Committee on Infractions and is involved in a finding of a violation of ethical conduct or in other findings by the committee resulting in proposed disciplinary action against that individual, the individual shall be given the opportunity by the institution involved in the proceeding to appeal through that institution any of the findings in question **[subject to the conditions of paragraph (c)]** to the NCAA Council; further, under such circumstances, the individual and personal legal counsel may appear before the Council at the time it considers the pertinent findings."

[Paragraphs (d) and (e), relettered as (e) and (f), unchanged.]

[Paragraph (f), relettered as Enforcement Procedure 6-(e), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To specify the criteria for Council review on appeal of determinations of fact and violations arrived at by the Committee on Infractions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved after motion to change order of business approved.

NO. 163 RESOLUTION: DRUG TESTING

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the use of controlled substances and allegedly performance-enhancing drugs represents a danger to the health of students and a threat to the integrity of amateur sport;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee be directed to develop an ongoing program of drug testing to identify those students involved in intercollegiate athletics competition who have used either controlled or allegedly performance-enhancing drugs; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that when fully implemented, the

program would include sanctions against those students who were found to have used prohibited drugs; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee shall inform each member of the Association of all details of the proposed testing program, including a list of prohibited substances, before July 1, 1984; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee present the proposed program and legislation necessary to implement it to the 1985 Convention."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 164 RESOLUTION: FOOTBALL TELEVISION

[Division I-A and I-AA football, common vote]

"Whereas, the Federal District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma has entered a decision and order declaring that the football television program of this Association, as set forth in Article Eight of the bylaws and in the television plan and contracts adopted pursuant thereto, violates the Federal antitrust laws, and on that basis enjoined this Association from carrying out the Plan and from otherwise controlling the televising of football games by Association members; and

"Whereas, the District Court's decision and order were affirmed with several modifications upon appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit; and

"Whereas, the judgments of the District Court and the Court of the Appeals are in the process of being reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and a stay of said judgments has been entered by the Supreme Court pending such review; and

"Whereas, the decision of the Supreme Court on such review probably will be announced prior to May or June of 1984; and

"Whereas, as a result of the foregoing litigation, the member institutions of this Association may be prevented from carrying out the present football television plan without modifications thereto; and

Whereas, in such event it will be desirable to make any necessary modifications promptly in order to meet the collective best interests of the members of the Association;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that in the event the Supreme Court shall determine that any part or all of the NCAA football television program, as set forth in Article Eight of the bylaws and in the Football Television Plan and contracts adopted or entered into pursuant thereto, is or may be invalid, the Football Television Committee is then authorized to develop an alternative national football television program for the 1984-1985 seasons, designed to advance the best interests of intercollegiate football and intercollegiate athletics to the extent it is practicable and legally permissible to do so, which program shall be in lieu of the 1982-1985 Football Television Plan.

"Be It Further Resolved, that, in such event, the committee shall proceed in accordance with the provisions of Section 2 of Bylaw 8, taking into account the legal principles developed in said litigation, to

formulate a 1984-1985 Football Television Plan in accordance with the purposes of this resolution.

"Be It Further Resolved, that authorization for the NCAA Council to call a special meeting of Divisions I-A and I-AA to consider football television issues under the principles adopted by that membership in a July 1983 mail referendum be extended to provide a reasonable opportunity for the membership to evaluate the United States Supreme Court's decision and the current litigation.

"Be It Finally Resolved, said special meeting shall occur as soon as feasible, consistent with the legal circumstances, and no member institution or group of institutions shall enter into any type of enforceable commitment with a network or any other entity for the 1984 season or any subsequent season until said meeting shall have had an opportunity to act under the terms of this resolution."

Source: NCAA Council (Football Television Committee).

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

Appendix B

78th Annual Convention

Nominating Committee

Chair—Charles H. Samson

- I-1—Bruce A. Corrie, Bucknell University
- I-1—Charles Harris, University of Pennsylvania
- I-2—Robert S. Bryan, North Carolina State University
- I-2—Cecil W. Ingram, Florida State University
- I-3—G. Jean Cerra, University of Missouri, Columbia
- I-3—Doris F. Chambers, Kent State University
- I-4—J. Gene Bourdet, San Diego State University
- I-4—Charles H. Samson, Texas A&M University
- II-1—Herman L. Sledzik, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
- II-2—Ola Goss, Norfolk State University
- II-3—Joan Boand, Grand Valley State Colleges
- II-4—Robert J. Hiegert, California State University, Northridge
- III-1—Charles Luce, Connecticut College
- III-2—Robert C. Deming, Ithaca College
- III-3—Julian L. Smith, St. Andrews Presbyterian College
- III-4—Mary Jean Mulvaney, University of Chicago

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—Kenneth G. Germann

- District 1—John P. Reardon Jr., Harvard University
- District 2—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
- District 3—Kenneth G. Germann, Southern Conference
- District 4—Dean Davenport, Ferris State College
- District 5—Carl R. Miller, University of North Dakota
- District 6—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
- District 7—C. Arnold Ferrin Jr., University of Utah
- District 8—Norman B. Jones, Utah State University
- At Large—Gordon Collins, College of Wooster
- At Large—Robert E. Hartwell, Babson College
- At Large—Vernon M. Smith, University of Toledo
- At Large—John L. Spring, Oswego State University College

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Judith M. Sweet

- District 1—Mary R. Barrett, University of Massachusetts, Boston
- District 2—Emma J. Best, University of District of Columbia
- District 3—Libba Birmingham, Mississippi State University
- District 4—Phyllis J. Bailey, Ohio State University
- District 5—Lynn Dorn, North Dakota State University
- District 6—Kay Don, Texas A&M University
- District 7—Barbara B. Hollman, University of Montana
- District 8—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
- At Large—Betty Kelly Austin, Alabama A&M University
- At Large—Marjorie Berkeley, Hollins College

At Large—Sylvia Moore, Oregon State University

At Large—Mary Roby, University of Arizona

Voting Committee

Chair—Edward L. Hanson

- District 1—William P. Holowaty, Eastern Connecticut State College
- District 2—Richard B. Yoder, West Chester University of Pennsylvania
- District 3—JoAnn Williams, St. Andrews Presbyterian College
- District 4—Theodore Kjolhede, Central Michigan University
- District 5—Betty A. Hoff, Luther College
- District 6—Billy M. Miller, Southwest Texas State University
- District 7—Col. John J. Clune, U.S. Air Force Academy
- District 8—Chris Voelz, University of Oregon
- At Large—Donald G. Combs, Eastern Kentucky University
- At Large—Stanley V. Wright, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck
- At Large—Edward L. Hanson, Montana State University

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Mary Ellen Cloninger

- Mary Ellen Cloninger, University of Wyoming
- Charles A. Eberle, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
- Darrell L. Peck, Buena Vista College

Credentials Committee

Chair—Judith Hirsch

- Rolla L. Anderson, Kalamazoo College
- David W. Coffey, Tennessee Technological University
- Judith Hirsch, California State University, Hayward

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

Chair of Business Sessions

John L. Toner, University of Connecticut

1985 Convention

Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee, January 14-16

Appendix C

NCAA Convention Sites, 1949-1984

(Hotels in parentheses.)

43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Towers)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)

NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943, and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January. The 1st and 2nd special Conventions were held in August. The 3rd special Convention was held immediately prior to the 70th Convention in January. The 4th special Convention was held in December.

Appendix D

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Phillip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
1971-1972	Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee
1973-1974	Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
1975-1976	John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
1977-1978	J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
1979-1980	William J. Flynn, Boston College
1981-1982	James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
1983-	John L. Toner, University of Connecticut

Secretary-Treasurer

*1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
*1908	William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954	Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968	Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University

*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

- 1969-1970 William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972 Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia Teachers College
 1973-1974 Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976 Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978 Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
 1979-1980 James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982 John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983- John R. Davis, Oregon State University

Division I Vice-President

- 1983- Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University

Division II Vice-President

- 1983 Edwin W. Lawrence, Cheyney State University
 1984 Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University

Division III Vice-President

- 1983 Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984 Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College